

amp
lat. lang
Gram.
E



THE HISTORICAL PRESENT

IN .

EARLY LATIN

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

ANNIE CROSBY EMERY

ELLSWORTH, MAINE

HANCOCK COUNTY PUBLISHING COMPANY, PRINTERS

1897

4900
3 | 2 | 98

THE HISTORICAL PRESENT

IN

EARLY LATIN

A DISSERTATION

PRESENTED TO THE FACULTY OF BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

ANNIE CROSBY EMERY

ELLSWORTH, MAINE

HANCOCK COUNTY PUBLISHING COMPANY, PRINTERS

1897



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2014

CHAPTER I.

CURRENT THEORIES OF THE HISTORICAL PRESENT.

The opinions hitherto advanced in regard to the Historical Present may be resolved into two main theories: one, that the Historical Present gives a lively representation of the past by bringing past events before the mind as if they were taking place in the present; the other, that it represents as continued or incomplete certain actions which are assigned by the context to a past sphere of time. The power of the Historical Present to enliven the narrative, which by the adherents of the first theory is regarded as its essential characteristic, is not denied by the adherents of the second, but is conceived to follow as a corollary from its function of portraying actions in the process of development.

The former of these theories is that stated in most of the grammars, and defended in one form or another by the larger number of modern scholars. Thus, the Historical Present is defined by Kühner¹ as follows: "In der Erzählung vergangener Ereignisse wird das Präsens . . . oft gebraucht . . . indem in der Lebhaftigkeit der Darstellung die Vergangenheit als Gegenwart angeschaut wird." Similar definitions are given by Holtze,² Reisig,³ Schneider,⁴ Draeger,⁵ Schmalz,⁶ and others. These

¹ *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*, 1878, II, §31, 2.

² *Syntaxis priscorum scriptorum Latinorum usque ad Terentium*, Leipsig, 1862, II, p. 61.

³ *Vorlesungen über lateinische Sprachwissenschaft*, bearbeitet von Hagen, Schmalz und Landgraf, Berlin, 1881-90, III, §288, 1.

⁴ *De temporum apud priscos scriptores Latinos usu*, Glatz, 1888, p. 7.

⁵ *Historische Syntax der lateinischen Sprache*, 2te Aufl., Leipsig, 1878-81, I, p. 230.

⁶ *Lateinische Syntax*, §22, in Iw. Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, 2te Aufl., 1890, II.

definitions imply, and sometimes even state,¹ that the Historical Present takes the place of the Aorist or Historical Perfect in narration, and assume that it is used to vividly represent the past because it denotes present time, that is, time contemporaneous with the speaker, and brings the events of the past into that present.

Brugmann,² on the other hand, maintains that the function of the Historical Present to represent the past depends upon the timeless character of the present tense, which enables it to be used of events that are past and future from the point of view of the speaker, as well as contemporaneous with him. Thus the speaker does not bring past events into the time in which he is speaking, but rather transfers himself back into the time in which the events took place. "Das sogenannte praesens historicum beruht nicht darauf dass der Sprechende bei besonders lebhafter Erzählung das vergangene Ereigniss in die Zeit in der er spricht rückt, sondern eher umgekehrt; er tritt aus den Rahmen der Zeit ganz heraus, drängt über dem Interesse an dem Ereignisse selbst die Vorstellung des zwischen dem Vorgang und der Erzählung des Vorganges bestehenden Zeitverhältnisses zurück, und versetzt sich in Gedanken in die Zeit als das Ereigniss sich eben abspielte, sodass er dasselbe wie in einem Drama oder wie auf einem Bilde vor sich sieht. Das praesens historicum beruht also auf dem zeitlich schrankenlosen Gebrauch dieses Tempus."

With this view Hultsch³ agrees, although he adds that ultimately there is no great difference between it

¹ So Holtze: "pro perfecto usurpatur." Reisig: "statt eines Aoristus praeteriti kann ein Präsens ersetzt werden im erzählenden Tone."

² *Berichte der k. sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, phil.-hist. Cl.*, XXXV (1883), p. 169.

³ *Die erzählenden Zeitformen bei Polybios, Abhandlungen der k. sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Cl.*, XIV (1894), I, p. 43. The first articles are found *ibid.*, XIII (1893), p. 1 ff, p. 347 ff.

and the view that by the Historical Present the speaker brings the past into the present.¹

The theory that the Historical Present does not represent the past as present, but denotes the continued and incomplete state of certain actions which are shown by the context to belong to the past, depends, like that of Brugmann, upon the timeless character of the present tense. This theory finds its strongest supporter in Hoffmann, and is expressed as follows in his *Zeitfolge nach dem Praesens historicum im Latein*, Wien, 1884, p. 14:

“Wenn in den Grammatiken dem Praesens hist. die Wirkung beigelegt wird, dass es eine vergangene Handlung als gegenwärtig darstelle, so kann ich dieser durchaus irrigen Ansicht gegenüber nur wiederholen was ich bereits . . . betont habe,² dass die grammatischen Zeitformen überhaupt nichts mit der natürlichen Zeit zu thun haben, dass sie nur Phasen der Handlung, des Seins bezeichnen, und dass daher auch das Praesens an sich durchaus nicht von der unmittelbaren Gegenwart des Sprechenden zu verstehen ist, sondern nur von der Gegenwart der Handlung, d. h. von der Phase ihres Vollzuges, ihres Eintretens und Stattfindens. In welcher natürlichen oder äusseren Zeit aber ein solches praesentisches, als eintretend oder stattfindend besagtes Sein liege, ob es schlechthin und für alle Zeit bestehe, ob strict nur zur Zeit des Sprechenden, ob zur Zeit anderer bereits vergangener Handlungen, dass lässt sich nicht aus dem Tempus selbst, sondern nur aus dem Zusammenhange entnehmen. Das Besondere in dem Gebrauche des historischen Praesens

¹ See also Miller, *The Imperfect and the Aorist in Greek*, which is a discussion of Hultsch's work, *American Journal of Philology*, XVI (1895), p. 183, note.

² Hoffmann first advanced his theory in *Die Construction der lateinischen Zeitpartikeln*, Wien, 1860, 2te Aufl., 1873, p. 183.

liegt nur darin, dass die betreffende Handlung nicht nach Massgabe ihrer Lage zur Gegenwart des Sprechenden als abgeschlossen ausgeprägt, sondern als geschehend hingestellt wird. Durch diese Darstellungsweise wird die Monotonie der Factenaufzählung unterbrochen; die Erzählung gewinnt eine gewisse Anschaulichkeit, Unmittelbarkeit und Lebendigkeit, aber sie gestaltet sich bei längerer Anfeinanderfolge solcher Praesentia unruhig und hastig, eben weil die Ereignisse nur als eintretend genannt werden, ohne dass durch das Tempus auch ihr Abschluss angezeigt wäre".¹

Kohlmann² also attributes this imperfect function to the Historical Present, and says that there is the same difference between the Historical Present and the Aorist that there is between the Imperfect and the Aorist.

Lattmann,³ on the contrary, maintains that the Historical Present, while it is to be referred to the achronistic

¹ Hoffmann's theory that the Historical Present is a purely preterite tense, used to denote the continuance of an action in the past, is largely based upon a study of the sequence of tenses after it. This leads him to make an unfortunate distinction between the "Historical Present", which must take the sequence of a past tense, except in such subordinate clauses as are so related to the rest of the sentence that they naturally tend toward the present sequence, and what he calls the "Real Present" (wirkliches Praesens), which, he says, admits of present sequence even when the subordinate clauses in their relation to the sentence naturally tend toward the past sequence (see below, Chapter V.). This "Real Present" he attributes to the poets—"Das ist ja gerade die Freiheit welche der Dichter vor dem Historiker voraus hat, dass er sich in die Gegenwart der von ihm erzählten Begebenheiten versetzen und nicht blos diese in praesentischer Form referieren, sondern nach Massgabe gleichsam seiner eigenen Anschauung und ethischen Betheiligung an den Vorgängen potential-hypothetische Urtheile, deliberativ-dubitativ Fragen, seltener eine subjective Begründung oder Einschränkung, oder eine potentiale Bestimmung im Conjunctiv des Praesens einmischen darf, wo der Prosaiker seinen zeitlich verschiedenen Standtpunkt durch Anwendung des Conjunctivus Imperfecti wahren muss". (pp. 16-18.)

² *De verbi Graeci temporibus*, Halle, 1873, pp. 6-7.

³ *Selbständiger und bezogener Gebrauch der Tempora im Lateinischen*, Göttingen, 1890, pp. 16-17.

present, yet contains no idea of continuance or incompleteness —“Denn damit dass ich eine Handlung als dauernd hinstelle, bezeichne ich sie eben—falls nicht ein bestimmter Bestandtheil der Verbalform auf eine andere Zeit hinweist—als gegenwärtig. Dauernd heisst in diesem Falle immer ‘zur Zeit des Sprechenden dauernd’. Man erkennt das schon daraus, dass, wenn eine dauernde Handlung der Vergangenheit bezeichnet werden soll, durchaus eine ausdrückliche Form der Vergangenheit (Imperfectum) gebraucht werden muss, während wenn es nicht darauf ankommt die Handlung der Vergangenheit als dauernd zu bezeichnen, viele Historiker das Präsens in solchem Umfange gebrauchen, dass das Perfectum historicum fast überflüssig erscheint”.¹

Although Lattmann thus opposes Hoffmann’s view, he does not agree with Brugmann that the Historical Present, while it is timeless, yet serves to vividly represent the past. This explanation is, Lattmann says, unsatisfactory because of the very frequent use of the tense and its largely arbitrary variation with the Historical Perfect —“Dagegen ist seine Erklärung leicht, sobald man das Präsens als achronistische Verbalform scharf sondert von dem Präsens als Tempus der Gegenwart”.²

Still another theory, more remote than Lattmann’s from the two main theories of the Historical Present, has been formulated by Rhodemeyer.³ He maintains that the Historical Present narrates the *bare fact of an action* which took place in a sphere of time determined as past by the context.

The above theories represent with sufficient accuracy the current views in regard to the Historical Present.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 16.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 17.

³ *Das Präsens Historicum bei Herodot und Thukydides*, Basel, 1889.

None of them has been based upon a complete study of the tense in early Latin. This early Latin means chiefly Plautus and Terence, and Varro (*de re rustica*), since the remains of the other dramatists, of Ennius, Lucilius, and the historians are too fragmentary to serve as a basis for any very certain conclusions. Plautus and Terence, especially, represent, so far as it can be represented by literature, the common speech of the people, unaffected by conscious attempts at artistic style. They reproduce familiar conversations of every-day life. A study of the Historical Present in these authors should, therefore, lead to the discovery of its nature and use in the spoken language. Its function in this spoken language was its original function, and the foundation of any use that it may have developed in literature.

To make the necessary study of the Historical Present in early Latin is the purpose of this dissertation. Any theory that may result in regard to the nature of the tense will be set forth without direct comparison with the theories hitherto advanced.

CHAPTER II.

THE HISTORICAL PRESENT IN EARLY LATIN.

In Plautus and Terence, and also in other ante-classical authors (Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius, Lucilius, the fragmentary comic and tragic poets, the fragmentary historians, and Varro), the Historical Present is used in the narration of past events, and varies in the same narration with the Historical Perfect, the Imperfect, the Pluperfect and the Historical Infinitive. The nature of its function as distinguished from the functions of these other tenses is the problem to be solved. The first step must be an investigation of the kinds of verbs which are found in the Historical Present. The following is a list of them, compared with the verbs found in other tenses when these tenses vary with the Historical Present in the same narration :¹

VERBS OF SAYING.

(Including verbs of calling, commanding, promising, threatening, denying, etc., and their opposites.)

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
inquit 129 (79 in Varro, <i>de r. r.</i>)				
aio 15		aiebam 5		
	ecfatus 1			
loquor 1				
colloquor 1	elocutus 1			colloqui 1

¹ In the above list the appended numeral gives the number of occurrences. The first person, as a rule, is cited, for the sake of convenience.

The citations from the early authors throughout this dissertation are made from the following editions:

Plautus: Goetz and Schoell, 1893-1895 (compared with Leo, 1895-96).

Terence: Dziatzko, 1884.

Livius Andronicus: Baehrens, *Fragmenta Poetarum Romanorum*, 1886.

Ennius (and Naevius, *Bellum Punicum*): L. Mueller, 1884.

Lucilius: Lachmann, 1876.

Tragic and comic poets: Ribbeck, *Scenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*, 2d ed., 1871-73.

Historians: Peter, *Historicorum Fragmenta, editio minor*, 1883.

Varro: Keil, 1884.

VERBS OF SAYING.

(Including verbs of calling, commanding, promising, etc.)

[CONTINUED.]

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
dico 18	dixi 11	dicebam 2	dixeram 1	dicere 1
edico 2				
indico 1				
praedico 1				praedicere 1
fateor 1				
narro 4				
percontor 1				
interrogo 3	interrogavi 1			
rogo 13				
rogito 2		rogitabam 2		
respondeo 3	respondi 4			
nomino 1				
clamo 1				
conclamo 2				
exclamo 7	exclamavi 1			
inclamo 1				
clamito 1				clamitare 1
boo 1				
voco 4	vocavi 2 advocavi 1			
invoco 4				
provoco 1				
revoco 1				
invito 1				
arcesso 1				
offirmo 1				
posco 3				
postulo 3				
oro 8				
exoro 2				
obsecro 3				
precor 1				
impero 1				
iubeo 7	iussi 6			
suadeo 1				
persuadeo 1				
adhortor 1		hortabar 1		hortari 1

VERBS OF SAYING.

(Including verbs of calling, commanding, promising, etc.)

[CONTINUED.]

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
	dehortatus 1			
adiuro 1		monebam 1 adiurabam 1		
	pollicitus 1			
increpo 1 nego 6	increpui 1			obiurgare 1
				negare 2 negitare 1 abnuere 1
abnuo 1 taceo 1	tacui 1 reticui 1			
sileo 1	obstipui 1 obmutui 1			

VERBS OF PERCEPTION.

(Including verbs of hearing, seeing, knowing, etc., and their opposites.)

	audivi 4			
video 12	vidi 4	exaudiebam 1		
	providi 1			
videor 2 viso 1	visus 7	videbar 1		videri 1
				circumvisere 1
aspicio 4 circumspicio 1 conspicio 3	aspexi 2 conspexi 1 despexi 1			
respicio 1				
	suspexi 1			
conspicor 3 specto 1 circumspecto 1	conspicatus 2	spectabam 1		
	inspectavi 1			
respecto 1	contemplatus 1 observavi 1	observabam 1		
			noram 1	

VERBS OF PERCEPTION.

(Including verbs of hearing, seeing, etc.)

[CONTINUED.]

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
	scivi 1 adgnovi 1 cognovi 3 ignovi 1 sensi 5		intellexeram 1	
cogito 1		cogitabam 1 putabam 1 rebar 1		putare 1
			oblitus fueram.	

VERBS OF EMOTION AND WILL.

(Including verbs of inclination, effort, etc.)

amo 1		amabam 3		
veneror 1	dilexi 1			
	veritus 1			
	metui 2	metuebam 2		
gaudeo 1	extimui 1	gaudebam 4		
conqueror 1	perdolui 1			
rideo 2				
fleo 1		[bam 1 conlacruma-		
	miseritus 1			lugere 2 mirarier 1 irasci 1
	peracui 1			
volo 1	volui 3 nolui 3'			nolle 1
cupio 1		cupiebam 1		
quaero 2	quaesivi 1	quaerebam 2		invidere 2 quaerere 1

VERBS OF EMOTION AND WILL.

(Including verbs of inclination, effort, etc.)

[CONTINUED.]

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
vestigo 1	studui 1	studebam 1		
		audebam 1		
laboro 1	passus 1			pati 1
pugno 1	pugnaui 1			
expecto 1		certabam 1		
		expectabam 1		
		praestolabar 1		
insto 1	institi 1			instare 2
destino 1				

INTRANSITIVE VERBS OF MOTION.

eo 4	ivi 1	ibam 3	
abeo 8	abii 7	abibam 1	abieram 1
adeo 2	adii 2		
circumeo 1			
coeo 1			
exeo 4			
	obii 1		
praetereo 1	praeterii 1		
prodeo 1			
redeo 3	redii 1	redibam 1	
	transii 1		
venio 11	veni 6		
advenio 4	adveni 1		
convenio 3	conveni 1	convenibam 1	convenieram 1
devenio 1			
	eveni 1		
intervenio 2			
pervenio 1	perveni 1		
proficiscor 2	profectus 1		
cedo 1			
	abscessi 1		abscesseram 1
accedo 2	accessi 8		
	concessi 1		
discedo 1			

INTRANSITIVE VERBS OF MOTION.

[CONTINUED.]

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
incedo 1	incessi 1			
procedo 2	processi 2			
recedo 1	recessi 3			
	successi 1			
adgredior 1				
egredior 1				
adcurro 5				
concurro 1				
	occucurri 1	occurrebam 1		
	praecucurri 1			
percurro 1				
pergo 4	perrexi 1			
commeo 1				
	commigravi 2			
praevertor 1				
revortor 2				
ingruo 1				
proruo 1				
penetro 1				
	insilui 1			
	resilui 1			
exilio 1				
subsilio 1				fugere 1
aufugio 1				
	aberravi 1			
	evasi 1			adcumbere 1
decumbo 1				
cado 3				
accido 1				
concido 2				
decido 1				
incido 1				
	elapsus 1			
	declinavi 1			
congenuclo 1				
adsido 1				
surgo 1				

INTRANSITIVE VERBS OF MOTION.

[CONTINUED.]

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
exsurgo 1				
conscendo 2				
inscendo 1				
	volavi 1			
convolo 1				
devolo 1				
involo 1				

TRANSITIVE VERBS OF MOTION

which may denote either momentary or progressive actions.¹

	admovi 1			
	semovi 1			
ago 6	egi 1		agebam 2	
	circumegi 1			
	coegi 1			
duco 4	duxi 3		duxeram 1	ducere 1
abduco 1	abduxi 1	abducebam 1		
conduco 1				
deduco 3				
educio 1	eduxi 1			
	perduxi 1			perducere 1
produco 2	produxi 1			
seduco 3				
subduco 2	subduxi 1			
aveho 3	avexi 1			
adveho 2	advexi 2	advexeram 1		
deveho 2				
mitto 3	misi 1			
	admisi 1			

¹ Here are included, in addition to the verbs that obviously belong to the category, some verbs which in their derived meanings have lost the idea of motion that they originally contained; and other verbs which contain the idea of motion only in so far as movement on the part of the subject is necessary to the performance of the action directed against the object. When this action may be conceived of as primarily momentary and instantaneous, the verbs expressing it may best be classified under a separate category. The two categories may, however, easily overlap.

TRANSITIVE VERBS OF MOTION

which may denote either momentary or progressive actions.

[CONTINUED.]

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
omitto 1				
fero 1	remisi 1			ferre 1
aufero 2	(te)tuli 2			
	detuli 3			
differo 1				
ecfero 2				perferre 1
refero 1	pertuli 1			
	transtuli 1			
tollo 1	sustuli 1			
extollo 1				
porto 1				
comporto 1				
inferino 1				
	abdidi 1			
addo 1				
edo 1	edidi 1			
indo 1				
abscondo 3				
				trahere 1
	abtraxi 1			
detraho 3	detraxi 1			rapere 1
		rapiebam 1		
arripio 2	arripui 1			
	corripui 2			
surripio 1				
surpuo 1				
	exemi 1			
extrudo 1				
	diremi 1			
ecfodio 1				
				expromere 1
segrego 1				
capio 5	cepi 1			
suscipio 1	suscepi 1			suscipere 1
		captabam 1		
prendo 5	prendi 1			

TRANSITIVE VERBS OF MOTION

which may denote either momentary or progressive actions.

[CONTINUED.]

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
comprehendo 1	reprehendi 2 conrasi 1			
lego 1	delegi 1			
pono 2	posivi 1			
depono 1	deposivi 1			
impono 2	imposivi 1			
oppono 1	opposivi 1 locavi 1			
conloco 3				
instruo 1	instruxi 1 institui 1			
statuo 1				
condo 1				
adligo 1				
adplico 1				
adnumero 1				
copulo 1				
resupino 1				
insinuo 1				tendere 1
saepio 1				tegere 1
consterno 1				
complector 1				
adorno 1	attigi 1			
solvo 2	exsolvi 1			

TRANSITIVE VERBS OF MOTION

which denote primarily momentary actions.

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
caedo 1				
excido 1				
praecido 1				
	compuli 1			
	reppuli 1			
	compressi 2			
opprimo 1	repressi 1			
compungo 1	conturbavi 1			
convorto 1				
pervorto 1		cruciabam 1		
enico 1				
ferio 2	exanimavi 1			
foedo 1				
frango 3				
iacio 1				
conicio 1	adieci 1			
	conieci 1			
	deieci 1			
	eieci 2			
	proieci 1			
	reicei 1			
	iactavi 1			
		immolabam 1		
	inquinavi 1			
	necavi 1			
obtrunco 1	obtruncavi 1			
offendo 1				
	oneravi 1			
optundo 1				
percello 1				
percutio 2	percussi 2			
protero 1				
pulto 1				
quatio 1				
	sacrificavi 1	sacrificabam 1		
saucio 1		sollicitabam 1		
sublino 1				
	torporavi 1			

VERBS OF REST.

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
maneo 2	mansi 1			
sto 1	requievi 1			
	astiti 2			
sedeo 1	restiti 1	restabam 1		
iaceo 1				

VERBS OF CONSTRUCTION.

facio 21	feci 17	faciebam 1		facere 1
adfacio 1				
conficio 1				
	effeci 1			
	patefecer 1			
	(fores)			
	praeferci 1			
facessco 1				
aedifico 1				
creo 1				
figo 1				
confingo 1				
configo 1				
paro 1	paravi 1			

VERBS OF GIVING, RECEIVING, YIELDING, HINDERING, ETC.

do 14	dedi 10	dabam 5		dare 1
reddo 1	reddidi 2			
dedo 2				dedere 1
	donavi 1			
	despondi 3			
devoveo 1				
commendo 1				
	tradidi 1			
accipio 2	accepi 2			
recipio 2				
ostendo 2				
placeo 2	placui 2			
lubet 1				

VERBS OF GIVING, RECEIVING, YIELDING, HINDERING, ETC.

[CONTINUED.]

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
deceat 1 pareo 1	conlubitum 1			
	parsi 1 sivi 1	serviebam 1		
sequor 2 consequor 3				sequi 1
				obsequi 1 persequi 1
adnuo 1 obdo 3	impedivi 1			

MISCELLANEOUS VERBS.¹

consono 1 tinno 1 cano 1		sonabam 1	
	tonuit 1		
contonat 1 tumultuor 1 perstrepo 1 nterpello 1 saluto 2 gratulor 2 plaudo 1			
	contempsī 1 sprevi 1 neglexi 1		
desero 1			

¹ It would be possible to subdivide these miscellaneous verbs into a large number of smaller classes, such as verbs of sound, of attainment, of buying and selling, of power, of beginning, of existence, etc., etc. Little, however, would be gained by such a division for the purposes of this dissertation. It would also be possible to embrace in preceding classes some of the verbs that are included here.

MISCELLANEOUS VERBS.

[CONTINUED.]

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
relinquo 3	perdidi 1 reliqui 2 destiti 1			
desino 1				
	credidi 1 fefelli 1	fallebar 1	insaniebam 1	
pario 2	demonstravi 1			
adopto 2	peperi 3			
educō 1	educavi 1			
		cuarabam 1	curaram 1	
commuto 1				
immuto 1				
celo 1				
simulo 1				simulare 1
		dissimulabam 1		
commoro 1				
supero 1		superabam 1		
vinco 1	vici 1 hausi 1			
		stabilibam 1		
	nactus 1			
		comperiebam 1		
repperio 1				
occupo 1				
obtimeo 1				
habeo 1	habui 2	habebam 1 tenebam 1		
participo 1				
vendo 3	vendidi 3			
emo 2	emi 3			
mercor 1	mercatus 1			
oppleo 1				
		complebam 1		
	inscripsi 1 consignavi 1 pactus 1			
mico 1				

MISCELLANEOUS VERBS.

[CONTINUED.]

<i>Historical Present.</i>	<i>Historical Perfect.</i>	<i>Imperfect.</i>	<i>Pluperfect.</i>	<i>Historical Infinitive.</i>
		confulgebam 2		
valeo 1				
potis sum 1	potui 2 quivi 1	poteram 2 quibam 1 eminebam 1		
vaco		solebam 1		
ebibo 1	bibi 1			
sulto 1				
condormisco 1	condormivi 1 lavi 1	nebam 1 texebam 1		
	coepti 22			
infat 5				
incipio 1				
occipio 1	occepi 14 natus 2 adolevi 1			
morior 2	mortuus 2			
emorior 1	emortuus 1 perii 3			emoriri 1
consto 1	constiti 4 contigi 1			
				pendere 1
sum 1	fui 23	eram 20		
adsum 1	adfui 1	aderam 2		
insum 1		inerat 1		

An examination of the above list shows that it is chiefly verbs of incomplete and continued action as opposed to verbs of completed and momentary action which tend toward the Historical Present. These verbs of incomplete and continued action are verbs that imply vision on the part of the speaker. They indicate that he is reviewing the events denoted by them and considering

them in their process of completion instead of simply recognizing the fact that they once took place and were completed in the past. In other words, these verbs are imperfect, not aoristic, in character. They are used, not for the purpose of stating the occurrence of events, but for the purpose of describing these events and portraying them to the mind in their process of development. They are employed in the description of scenes that the mind reviews.

Now if it is chiefly these verbs which tend toward the Historical Present, then it would seem clear that the Historical Present is imperfect in character, and is used as a tense of vision, to describe, not merely state, the events of the past. This at once distinguishes it from the Historical Perfect. But how is it distinguished from the Imperfect, since it is not to be supposed that two different tenses have the same function? The distinction between the Imperfect and the Historical Present may be briefly defined as follows: by the Imperfect the speaker views the events as past from the point of view of his own present, and describes them as going on in the past; by the Historical Present he views them as if they were going on before his eyes in the sphere of his own present, whether he does this by bringing the events out of the past into his actual present, or by putting himself back into their past. In either case he makes the present of the events his present.

This, then, is the function of the Historical Present—the representation of past events as if they were going on in the present before the eyes of the spectator. Such a function seems to spring from the timeless character of the present tense. This tense in itself has not the limitations of any particular sphere of time, but denotes actions in a state of continuance, whether in the past, present or future. If the speaker throws himself backward into the

past (or draws the past into his present), and views actions that in fact are past as going on before his eyes, he uses the Historical Present to express them. In the same way it is possible to explain the use of the Present for the Future; that is, if the speaker projects himself forward into the future and views events that in fact are yet to come as going on before his eyes he may use the Present to express them.

If the essential characteristic of the Historical Present is the representation of the past, so that scenes and events are described as if they were taking place before the eyes of the speaker, it follows that the use of the tense need not be confined to verbs that express continued and incomplete activities, but may be extended to verbs of aoristic conceptions. When the speaker reviews a scene he may bring before his mind as still going on not only activities that in themselves are incomplete and continued, such as those denoted by many verbs of motion, by verbs of sound, vision, emotion, construction, etc., but also activities that in themselves are completed, such as those denoted by verbs of attainment, verbs of momentary action (killing, striking, etc.), etc. In almost all scenes that a speaker may recall will be found intermingled these two kinds of activities, the one of which would naturally be expressed by the Imperfect, the other by the Aorist. When these scenes are taken out of the limits of the past and presented to the mind as if they were going on before the eyes of the speaker, both kinds of activities are described by the Historical Present as parts of a course of events that is in progress in the sphere of time that the speaker is regarding as present. Of the individual actions in this course of events some may be of momentary, others of incomplete character. All may be described by the Historical Present as taking place before the eyes. Hence the decision

in any particular case whether the Historical Present represents an Imperfect or an Aorist in narration, is a subordinate consideration.

After the function of the Historical Present as a means of representing the past as present has been established, another problem presents itself. Why in the same narration, in the description of the same scene, which is being portrayed as if it were taking place before the eyes of the speaker, should the Historical Present be interrupted by past tenses, notably by the Historical Perfect and Imperfect? It is commonly claimed that such variation, especially that of the Historical Present with the Historical Perfect, is arbitrary, and that the mind passes without any especial reason from one tense to another, from the narrative past to the more vivid present.¹ In ante-classical Latin it is doubtful whether this sweeping assertion holds good. An investigation of the narrative passages seems to show that in general some reason exists for the variation in narration of the Historical Present with other tenses.

The Historical Perfect, which is found in variation with the Historical Present oftener than any other tense, frequently has its ordinary character as a tense of simple narration to give a mere statement of fact, as distinguished from the more descriptive character of the Historical Present. This use of the Perfect is found often in the introduction or conclusion of dramatic scenes that are described by the Historical Present. It is also found in the narration of the scenes themselves to mark explanatory or parenthetical facts. Thus the tendency of certain verbs toward the Perfect instead of the Historical Present is explained. *Sum*, for example, and its com-

¹ So Holtze, *op. cit.*, p. 64: "non raro in eodem orationis tenore variant inter se et permutantur perfectum et praesens historicum." Schneider, *op. cit.*, p. 7: "praesens, perfectum et infinitum etiam historicum promiscue se invicem excipere." Lattmann, *op. et loc. cit.* (see Chapter I, p. 7), and others.

pounds are found more often in the Perfect because they are used chiefly of introductory or explanatory facts, which are to be merely stated, not described. Such verbs, also, as *occipio*, *incipio*, *volo*, etc., are found most frequently in the Perfect because they are in themselves merely introductory to their dependent infinitives upon which the real emphasis falls. The verb and the infinitive together form one expression almost equivalent to a finite tense (Imperfect) of the verb to which the infinitive belongs. If, however, the act of beginning, wishing, etc., is to be emphasized and brought into line with the other acts making up the scene, then these verbs are thrown into the Historical Present.

Often, on the other hand, the Perfect itself is a more integral part of the scene. In these cases it is used chiefly to emphasize the completion of an activity, or its instantaneous or momentary character, thus differing from the Historical Present which of necessity represents activities in their process of completion. Thus verbs that in their nature denote an instantaneous action are more likely to be found in the Perfect than in the Historical Present, while, on the other hand, verbs that naturally express continuance, such as verbs of vision and emotion, although usually found in the Historical Present, may be put into the Perfect when the suddenness of the activity is to be emphasized.

Negative conceptions also tend toward the Perfect, but, like other specifically aoristic conceptions, they may be expressed by the Historical Present when they are a closely connected part of the scene.

Deserving of special mention in any discussion of the variation of the Historical Present with the Historical Perfect is the large class of verbs of saying. These verbs are found chiefly in the Historical Present, for they

are essentially verbs that would occur in the description of scenes. A large number, in which the act of speaking, answering, calling, shouting, praying, etc., is emphasized and made an integral part of the scene, seem to have the real force of the Historical Present. Such verbs, however, as *inquam*, *aio*, and even the present forms of *dico*, seem to be used phraseologically, to indicate, as it were, the parts of the speakers in the dialogue, with but little idea of any representation of the past.

Thus it will be seen that in general the variation of the Historical Present with the Historical Perfect is far from arbitrary. Yet cases will be found where no especial reason can be assigned for the change of tenses. In familiar conversation, particularly, a speaker may easily pass from one to the other.

The variation of the Imperfect with the Historical Present is much less frequent than that of the Perfect. This follows from the close resemblance between the Historical Present and the Imperfect. An examination of the passages in which the two tenses occur again emphasizes the fact that the special function of the Historical Present is to portray past events as if they were present, whether these events be continuative or aoristic in character. As soon as the continuance of the action is to be emphasized, or the description of its details becomes especially important, the Imperfect is used. Thus the Imperfect is found most frequently of verbs that denote effort, where the slow process of attainment is emphasized, and of verbs that denote the state or condition of some subject. The Imperfect of *sum* and its compounds is almost as frequent as the Perfect because it often describes a state or condition. The rare Historical Present of these verbs puts the emphasis on the fact that the state or condition exists in the sphere that the speaker is regarding as present.

Furthermore, the Imperfect is used, as might be supposed, when repeated or customary actions are to be described.

The Pluperfect is occasionally found in the same narration with the Historical Present, but is always accompanied by Historical Perfects and Imperfects as well. It is used to denote completion in the past from the point of view of the actual time of the events.¹

Finally is to be noticed the variation of the Historical Present with the Historical Infinitive. This variation is not infrequent although in every case the narration also contains other tenses.

The nature of the Historical Infinitive, like that of the Historical Present, is still a matter of dispute. One point, however, is generally agreed upon, namely, that it is used to give a rapid sequence of events; and this seems to be its function in ante-classical Latin. It thus resembles the Imperfect in its descriptive character, while it differs from it in portraying, not the slow process of development, but the hurried and lively and sometimes confused succession of details. Even where the Historical Infinitive resembles the Imperfect in denoting repeated action it still retains its character of rapid description. The Imperfect denotes only the repetition. The Historical Infinitive includes the idea of the rapid and lively succession of occurrences.²

On the other hand, the Historical Infinitive is often compared with the Historical Present. In ante-classical

¹ There is one example of a Pluperfect used to denote an instantaneous action ("Plusquamperfektum der Schnelligkeit"), *Phormio* 594. See Chapter III, A, 5.

² So Grysar, *Ueber die Bedeutung und den Gebrauch des historischen Infinitivs im Lateinischen*, *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien*, IV (1853), p. 779: "Dann aber hat das Imperfectum nur den einfachen Begriff der Widerholung; die Merkmale des wechselnden, beweglichen, des raschen Aufeinanderfolgens, kurz diejenigen Momente, welche eben den character der Lebendigkeit in die Schilderung bringen, liegen nicht im Imperfect, sondern nur in dem Infinitive."

Latin, at least, it seems to resemble the Historical Present in that it represents the past as if it were present, and to differ from it in that it is more essentially descriptive.¹ The Historical Present may be used of aoristic as well as of imperfect conceptions, and it has been indicated that when continuance and description are to be emphasized it is the Imperfect, not the Historical Present, which is used. The Historical Infinitive, then, while it differs from the Historical Present in its descriptive, and from the Imperfect in its hurried and lively character, may also be said to combine parts of the natures of both tenses. For, as has been pointed out, like the Historical Present it represents past events as if they were going on in the present, and like the Imperfect it describes these events.

In the narrative passages in ante-classical Latin in which the Historical Infinitive varies with the Historical Present and other tenses its peculiar function seems, on the whole, to be clearly maintained.

In concluding this general discussion of the variation of the Historical Present with other tenses, the question of metrical restrictions must be taken into consideration. In

¹ See Grysar, *op. cit.*, p. 777: "Das praesens historicum und der historische Infinitiv haben dies mit einander gemein, dass sie etwas vergangenes vergegenwärtigen; aber durch jenes wird immer eine einzelne Thatsache, ein Ereigniss dargestellt, während, wie bereits gesagt worden, durch den Infinitiv ein Zustand geschildert wird." Contrast Mohr, *De Infinitivo Historico*, Halle, 1878, p. 8: "hoc reiciendum est, quod dicunt, quae infinitivo historico narrentur 'quasi in praesens legentium tempus proferri.' Cuius opinionis causa fuit haec, quod falso hic infinitivus praesenti tempori tribuitur, cum certum tempus omnino non significet. Ea enim re differt a praesente historico, quo res gestae eis, qui legunt, alia ex alia ante oculos proponuntur, velut si eodem temporis momento ab ipsis conspiciantur." And Hoffmann, *Zeitfolge nach dem Praesens historicum*, pp. 14-15: "als praesentischer Infinitiv ist er schlechthin der Name der Handlung in der Phase ihres Vollzuges: dass er eine Vergegenwärtigung bewirke, die betreffende der Vergangenheit angehörige Handlung oder Zuständlichkeit in die Zeit des Erzählenden rücke, wird man schwerlich behaupten wollen."

any form of poetry the choice of words must be more or less determined by the exigencies of the metre, and it may be claimed that often in Plautus and Terence no other reason need be sought for the variation in tenses than the necessity for the occurrence of long or short syllables in certain parts of the verse. But the poets must be credited with the ability to adapt their verses to normal linguistic usages; and a comparison of such forms as *accedo, accessi; duco, duxi; dico, dixi*, etc., will indicate how free in reality the choice of, at least, Historical Present or Historical Perfect was. In comparatively few cases in Plautus and Terence is it difficult to explain the variation of the Historical Present with other tenses on more thorough-going principles than the external necessities of metre. That in these few cases metrical restrictions are a more satisfactory explanation than the spontaneity of colloquial speech is doubtful. The influence of metre is not by any means to be wholly denied, but it seems hardly justifiable to assume it as a ground for variation of tenses, parallel to more fundamental principles of language.

A detailed investigation of the passages in which the Historical Present varies with other tenses in the narration of past events will follow in Chapter III.

The discussion of this chapter may conclude with a brief reference to the use of the Historical Present in literature as distinguished from its use in the spoken language. A study of the Historical Present in ante-classical Latin shows that, originating in the timeless use of the present tense, it was used in the colloquial speech of the people to bring past events before the mind as if they were going on in the present. Such representation of the past involves a certain liveliness in narration. But this liveliness must not be unduly emphasized. In ordinary conversation a speaker may relate past events as if they

were present without wishing to convey an unusually lively impression of these events to his hearers, and without himself distinguishing them with especial vividness from other events. Furthermore, it is not to be supposed that in a colloquial narration a speaker is conscious of the function of each tense that he uses, and that the reasons for the variation of the Historical Present with the Historical Perfect, the Imperfect, etc., are present to his own mind.

In literature, on the contrary, the Historical Present became a conscious rhetorical device, a distinct organon of style. It was in origin a colloquial and vulgar usage. In the hands of stylists it became, through its power of representing the past as present, a means for producing artistic effects.¹

Being a tense of narration, the Historical Present was naturally used with especial frequency by the historians. Even the fragments of the historians of the ante-classical period indicate an extended employment of the tense, but no certain conclusions as to the manner of its use can be drawn.²

The original colloquial character of the Historical Present, rather than the fact, so often alleged, that it is foreign to the nature of epic narration, probably explains

¹ So Brugmann, *op. cit.*, p. 170: "Das praesens historicum beruht . . . auf dem zeitlich schrankenlosen Gebrauch dieses Tempus, und es erklärt sich daraus die Thatsache, dass das praesens historicum in den meisten Sprachen auch dann gebraucht wird wenn keine besondere Lebhaftigkeit des Ausdrucks angestrebt wird. Erst kunstmässige Handhabung der Sprache bediente sich dieses Praesens als eines vollkommenen rhetorischen Mittels zur Hervorhebung und zur Belebung der Darstellung."

² There seems to be reason to believe that in the later historians (notably Livy and Tacitus), at least, the aoristic function of the Historical Present became prominent and that its use was more similar to that of the Historical Perfect than to that of the Imperfect. But a thorough investigation of the tense in the historians, and, indeed, in most Latin authors, is yet to be made.

why it is not found in Homer.¹ In the Latin epic the Historical Present is widely used, which might seem to be an indication of the artificial, or, at least, rhetorical character of this kind of literature in Latin.² The fragments of Naevius and Ennius show that the Historical Present had become an organon of style even in the early epic. And it is interesting to note that Livius Andronicus uses the tense in his translation of the *Odyssey*.³

That the Historical Present was used, in early Latin, at least, not only familiarly in conversation, and artistically in literature, but also in public documents, is indicated by its appearance in one of the inscriptions to the Scipios (*Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*, I, 29):

“Tauresia Cisauna Samnio cepit
Subigit omne Loucanam opsidisque abdoucit.”

Here no lively representation of the past can be assumed. Neither is there anything in the nature of the verbs to lead to the variation between the Historical Perfect and the Historical Present. The inscription is of peculiar interest, since it seems to show that the Historical Present, even in language so nearly allied to the spoken language as that of such documents, tended towards an aoristic function, indistinguishable from that of the Historical Perfect.

¹ Cf. Gildersleeve, *Pindar*, Introduction, p. 102: “Brugmann has . . . vindicated the proethnic rights of the historical present on the just ground of the timelessness of the present. It is therefore not a little remarkable that Pindar uses it as little as Homer uses it. To them the historical present must have been either too vulgar or too hurried.” Rhodemeyer, *op. cit.*, p. 70, explains the lack of the Historical Present in Homer, according to his theory of the nature of the tense: “weil es im Epos weniger am Platze war eine Handlung nur in Betreff der Zeit durch eine andere zu bestimmen, oder gar eine notizenartige Angabe zu machen.”

² In Vergil, according to Ley, *Vergilianarum Quaestionum specimen prius, de temporum usu*, Saarbrücken, 1877, the Historical Present plays a somewhat peculiar part, in that it denotes regularly a resulting action, of which the Historical Perfect denotes the ground. For indications of a similar use of the Historical Present in the early epic, see Chapter III, B, 2, a.

³ Lines 28–30. See *ibid.*

This tendency may be explained from the frequent colloquial usage of the Historical Present to represent aoristic activities of the past.¹

A few Historical Presents from early inscriptions are also preserved in the grammarians. Caesius Bassus quotes the following verse from the votive tablet of M'. Acilius Glabrio :²

“*Fundit, fugat, prosternit* maxumas legiones.”

And Censorinus quotes a similar anonymous verse, probably from an inscription :³

“Magnum numerum *triumphat* hostibus deuictis.”

All of these Historical Presents are excellent illustrations

¹The only other Historical Present that can be cited from early Latin inscriptions occurs in the inscription on the restored Columna Rostrata (*C. I. L.*, I, 195), where one Historical Present varies arbitrarily with several Historical Perfects:

“Secestanosque op-
sitioned *exemet*, lectionesque Cartaciniensis omnis
maximosque macistratos luci palam post dies
novem castreis *ecfociont*. Macelamque opidom vi
puenandod *cepet*—” etc.

The form *ecfociont*, however, is in itself doubtful, in addition to the general doubtfulness of the whole inscription. Mommsen and Ritschl hold that the original column contained either no inscription at all or a very brief one, and that the above inscription was composed for the restored column in archaistic style during the early Empire, probably under Claudius (*C. I. L.*, I, p. 40; Ritschl's *Opuscula* IV, p. 204). Wölfflin, on the other hand, maintains that the inscription is genuinely old, and that the restoration of it in the time of Augustus concerned only the forms of the letters (*Sitzungsberichte der k. bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu München, phil.-hist. Cl., Heft III* [1890], p. 293).

A variation of Presents with Perfects occurs also in the epitaph of Claudia (*C. I. L.*, I, 1007):

“Suom mareitum corde *deilexit* sovo.
Gnatos duos *creavit*: horunc alterum
In terra *linquit*, alium sub terra *locat*.
Domum *servavit*: lanam *fecit*.”

These Presents, however, are not Historical. But see Ritschl's *Opuscula*, IV, p. 223, foot-note, where the inscription is quoted in support of the Historical Presents found in the above Scipio inscription.

² Keil, *Grammatici Latini*, VI, 265.

³ *Ibid.*, 615.

of the tense, but their isolation from other tenses makes it impossible to decide how far, in the original context, they may have vividly represented the past, or how far, like those in the Scipio inscription to which they seem closely parallel, they may have tended towards an aoristic function.

CHAPTER III.

THE VARIATION OF THE HISTORICAL PRESENT WITH OTHER TENSES.

It will be well to examine first passages drawn from the comic poets and from Varro, that is, from the literature that represents most nearly the speech of the people, and to leave for later consideration passages drawn from tragedy, from the epic and satire, and from history, that is, from the remains of ante-classical Latin that represent literary styles.

A.

1. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect.*

a. In some passages the description of a scene is introduced by a Perfect; given by Historical Presents; and concluded again by one or more Perfects. The concluding Perfects may simply state the occurrence of some event, or may denote some sudden, instantaneous action, or some resulting action.

Truculentus 645-55:

- 645 Rus mane dudum hinc ire me *iussit* pater,
Vt bubus glandem prandio depromerem.
Post illoc ueni quam *aduenit* si deis placet
Ad uillam argentum meo qui debebat patri,
Quī ouis Tarentinas erat mercatus de patre.
650 *Quaerit* patrem: *dico* esse in urbe, *interrogo*
Quid eum uelit. * * * * *
Homo cruminam sibi de collo *detrahit*,
Minas uiginti mi *dat*, *accipio* lubens,
Condo in cruminam: ille *abiit*,¹ ego pera minas
655 Ouis in crumina hac in urbem *detuli*.

Here the concluding Perfects are of sudden actions.

¹ Leo reads *abit*, thus making this action a part of the scene itself.

Cf. *Captiui* 478–89, where, after one scene has been concluded by a Perfect of instantaneous action and a negatived Perfect, activities implying a succession of scenes are portrayed by Historical Presents, and the description is left suspended, with no concluding Perfect:

- Nam ego ut dudum hinc abii, *accessi* ad adulescentes in foro:
 ‘Salvete’ *inquam*. ‘quo imus’ *inquam* ‘ad prandium?’ atque illi *tacent*.
 480 ‘Quis ait: hoc? aut quis proficitur?’ *inquam*: quasi muti *silent*,
 Neque me *rident*. ‘ubi cenamus una?’ *inquam*: atque illi *abnuunt*.
Dico unum ridiculum dictum de dictis melioribus,
 Quibus solebam menstrualis epulas ante adipiscier:
 Nemo *ridet*. *sciui* extemplo rem de compecto geri.
 485 Ne canem quidem irritatum *uoluit* quisquam imitari,
 Saltem si non arriderent, dentes ut restringerent.
Abeo ab illis, postquam uideo me sic ludificari:
Pergo ad alios, *uenio* ad alios, deinde ad alios—una res.
 Omnes de compecto rem *agunt* quasi in Velabro olearii.

Note the negatived Historical Presents in 481 and 484.¹

In *Phormio* 859–881 one scene concludes with a series of Perfects, denoting a series of single, instantaneous actions. After an intervening dialogue another short scene follows, depicted by Historical Presents, and concluding with a Perfect of resulting action:

- Vt modo argentum tibi dedimus apud forum, recta domum
 860 *Sumus profecti*; interea *mittit* erus me ad uxorem tuam.
 Vbi in gynaeceum ire occipio, puer ad me *adcurrit* Mida,
 Pone *prendit* pallio, *resupinat*: *respicio*, *rogo*
 Quam ob rem retineat me: *ait* esse uetitum intro ad eram accedere.
 865 ‘Sophrona modo fratrem huc’ *inquit* ‘senis introduxit Chremem’;
 Eumque nunc esse intus cum illis. hoc ubi ego audiui, ad fores
 Suspenso gradu placide ire *perrexi*, *accessi*, *astiti*,
 Animam *compressi*, aurem *admoui*:
 : : : : : : : :
 : : : : : : : :
 patruos interea inde huc *egreditur* foras:
 Hand multo post cum patre idem *recipit* se intro denuo:
 880 *Ait* uterque tibi potestatem eius adhibendae dari.
 Denique ego *sum missus*.

¹ Cf. *Curculio*, 352; *Aulularia*, 710; *Amphitruo*, 238 and 239; *Heauton Timorumenos*, 140. See Chapter II, p. 26.

Similar reasons may be assigned for the variation of Historical Presents and Historical Perfects in *Aulularia* 467-71; *Truculentus* 397-409; *Casina* 39-45; *Curculio* 596-97, where there is no introductory Perfect; *Adelphi* 470-74, where the scene is confined to a single Historical Present; cf. with this passage *Adelphi* 542, where, however, there is no concluding Perfect; so also, Varro, *de re rustica* I, 2, 1-2, where the scene is depicted by *inquam*, *inquit*, *inquit*.¹

b. In other passages the description of the scene itself contains Perfects, as well as being introduced and concluded by Perfects.

In *Aulularia* 371-84 the scene, introduced by a Perfect, is depicted by Historical Presents, varied with an explanatory, almost parenthetical, *fuere*. It is concluded by a Perfect which sums up preceding activities, and is followed by Perfects of ordinary narration:

- Volui animum tandem confirmare hodie meum,*
Vt bene haberem me filiae nuptiis.
Venio ad macellum, rogito pisces; indicant
Caros: agninam caram, caram bubulam,
 375 *Vitulinam, cetum, porcinam, cara omnia:*
*Atque eo fuere cariora, aes non erat.*²
Abeo iratus illinc, quoniam nil est qui emam.
Ita illis impuris omnibus adii manum.
Deinde egomet mecum cogitare inter uias
 380 *Occepi: festo die si quid prodegeris,*
Profesto egere liceat, nisi peperceris.
Postquam hanc rationem uentri cordique edidi,
Accessit animus ad meam sententiam,
Quam minumo sumptu filiam ut nuptum darem.

Note that here *abeo* (377) is regarded as a part of the scene,

¹ But see Chapter II, p. 27.

² The clause containing the only Imperfect resembles so closely a subordinate causal clause that the passage may be better quoted here than under the variation of the Historical Present, Historical Perfect and Imperfect.

whereas it is often used in the Perfect of instantaneous action to conclude a scene. Cf. also *Captiui* 487, quoted above, p. 36.

In *Mostellaria* 1045-52 after the introductory Perfect, the description of the scene is begun by Perfects of ordinary narration, which are then followed, possibly under the stress of increasing excitement, by Historical Presents:

- 1045 *Abii* illa per angiportum ad hortum nostrum clanculum.
 Ostium quod in angiportost horti, *patefeci* fores,
 Eaque *eduxi* omnem legionem, et maris et feminas.
 Postquam ex opsidione in tutum eduxi manipularis meos,
Capio consilium, ut senatum congerronum conuocem.
 1050 Quoniam conuocaui, atque illi me ex senatu *segregant*.
 Vbi ego me uideo uenire in meo foro, quantum potest
Facio idem quod plurimi alii quibus res timida aut turbidast.

In *Curculio* 329-63 two scenes are bound together into one narration by the Historical Present *abeo*, which portrays the intervening activity. The first is introduced by a Perfect and described by Historical Presents, except for *respondit*, for which, as distinguished from the Historical Presents, there seems to be no especial reason, and the negative *noluit*. After *abeo* follows the second scene, very vivaciously described by Historical Presents, varying only with an explanatory and almost parenthetical *fuit*, with the negative *nolui*, and with *opposiuit*, for which there seems to be no especial reason. The scene ends with a Perfect of instantaneous action:

- Postquam tuo iussu profectus sum, *perueni* in Cariam:
 330 *Video* tuom sodalem, argenti *rogo* uti faciat copiam.
 Scires uelle gratiam tuam: *noluit* frustrariar,
 Vt decet uelle hominem amicum amico atque opitularier:
Respondit mihi paucis uerbis atque adeo fideliter,
 Quod tibi item sibi esse, magnam argenti inopiam.

.

- Postquam mihi responsumst, *abeo* ab illo maestus ad forum,
 Med illo frustra aduenisse. forte *aspicio* militem:
Aggredior hominem, *saluto* adueniens: 'salve' *inquit* mihi,
Prendit dexteram, *seducit*, *rogat* quid ueniam Cariam:
 340 *Dico* me illo aduenisse animi causa. ibi me *interrogat*,
 Ecquem in Epidauro Lyconem tarpezitam nouerim.
Dico me nouisse. 'Quid? lenonem Cappadocem?' *Annuo*
 Visitasse. 'Sed quid eum uis?' 'Quia de illo emi uirginem
 Triginta minis, uestem, aurum: et pro his decem coaccidunt minae.'
 345 'Dedisti tu argentum?' *inquam*. 'Immo apud trapezitam situmst
 Illum quem dixi Lyconem, atque ei mandaui, qui anulo
 Meo tabellas obsignatas attulisset, ut daret
 Operam, ut mulierem a lenone cum auro et ueste abduceret.'
 Postquam hoc mihi narrauit, *abeo* ab illo. *reuocat* me ilico,
 350 *Vocat* me ad cenam: religio *fuit*, denegare *nolui*.
 'Quid si abeamus, decumbamus?' *inquit*. consilium *placet*;
 Neque diem *decet* me morari neque nocti nocerier.
 Omnis res *paratast*¹ et nos quibus paratumst *assumus*.
 Postquam cenati atque appoti, talos *poscit* sibi in manum,
 355 *Prouocat* me in aleam, ut ego ludam. *pono* pallium:
 Ille suum anulum *opposiuit*, *inuocat* Planesium.
 *iacit* uolturios quattuor.
 Talos *arripio*, *inuoco* almam meam nutricem Herculem,
Iacto basilicum, *propino* magnum poculum: ille *ebibit*,
 360 Caput *deponit*, *condormiscit*. ego ei *subduco* anulum,
Deduco pedes de lecto clam, ne miles sentiat.
Rogant me serui quo eam: *dico* me ire quo saturi solent.
 Ostium ubi conspexi, exinde me ilico protinam *dedi*.

In *Adelphi* 617-24 the scene, introduced by a Perfect, is described by Historical Presents and concluded by two Perfects of momentary action:

- id anus mi indicium *fecit*.
 Nam ut hinc forte ad obstetricem erat missa, ubi eam uidi, ilico
Accedo, *rogito*, Pamphila quid agat, iam partus adsiet,
 620 Eon obstetricem accersat. illa *exclamat* 'abi, abi: iam, Aeschine,
 Satis diu dedisti uerba: sat adhuc tua nos frustratast fides.'
 'Hem, quid istuc obsecro' *inquam* 'est?' 'ualeas, habeas illam
 quae placet.'
Sensi ilico id illas suspicari: sed *reprehendi* me tamen,
 Ne quid de fratre garrulae illi dicerem ac fieret palam.

¹ Historical Present (*est parata*), rather than Perfect.

Other passages in which the description of a scene that is introduced, or concluded, or both, by Perfects contains also Perfects in itself are: *Miles Gloriosus* 174-79; *Adelphi* 405-7; *Eunuchus* 130-43; *Andria* 855-8.

In some passages a scene is described by Historical Presents and Perfects, without introductory or concluding Perfects.

Poenulus 650-66, where the Historical Presents vary with one Perfect of instantaneous action:

- 650 Nisi dudum mane ut ad portum processimus,
Atque istum e naui exeuntem oneraria
Videmus. adiit ad nos extemplo exiens:
Salutat, respondemus.
. . . . Sermonem ibi nobiscum *copulat.*
655
Ait se peregrinum esse. . . .

In *Casina* 321-23 the description of the scene, begun in Historical Presents, is interrupted by a question, and then taken up again by a Perfect of simple narration:

- OL. *orat, obsecrat,*
Ne Casinam uxorem ducat. LY. Quid tu postea?
OL. *Negavi.*

In *Asinaria* 343-56 the variation is chiefly in the tenses of verbs of saying, and seems to have no especial reason:

- Verum in tonstrina ut sedebam, me *infit* percontarier,
Ecquem filium Stratonis nouerim Demaenetum.
345 *Dico* me nouisse extemplo et me eius servum *praedico*
Esse et aedis *demonstravi* nostras. . . .
Ait se ob asinos ferre argentum atriensi Saureae,
. . . .
. . . .
350 Quoniam ille elocutus haec sic
Extemplo *facio* facitum me atque magnificum uirum,
Dico me esse atriensem. sic hoc *respondit* mihi:
. . . .
. . . .
Ego me *dixi* erum adducturum.

Note in 345 and 351 the Historical Presents modified

by *extemplo*, an adverb that more naturally accompanies a Perfect of instantaneous or sudden action, as, for example, in *Poenulus* 652, quoted above, p. 40.¹

In *Andria* 353-65 a vivid narration contains descriptions of two scenes, which, together with the intervening and the following activities of the narrator, are portrayed by Historical Presents, except for two Perfects at the end, of instantaneous and momentary actions:

Tuos pater modo me *prehendit*: ait tibi uxorem dare
Hodie, item alia multa, quae nunc non est narrandi locus.

355 Continuo ad te properans *percurro* ad forum, ut dicam haec tibi.

Vbi te non inuenio, ibi *ascendo* in quandam excelsum locum.

Circumspicio: nusquam. forte ibi huius *uideo* Byrriam;

Rogo: *negat* uidisse. mihi molestum; quid agam *cogito*.

Redeunti interea ex ipsa re mi *incidit* suspicio .

. Ego me continuo ad Chremem. .

Quom illo aduenio, solitudo ante ostium: iam id *gaudeo*.

. *Maneo*. interea intro ire neminem

Video, exire neminem; matronam nullam in aedibus,

365 Nil ornati, nil tumulti: *accessi*; intro *aspexi*.

Note *accessi* here over against *accedo* in *Adelphi* 619, quoted above, p. 39.

In *Hecyra* 38-42 the scene of the second failure of the play is vividly portrayed by Historical Presents, ending with the negatived *potui*:

refero denuo.

Primo actu *placeo*. quom interea rumor uenit

40 Datum iri gladiatores, populus *conuolat*,

Tumultuantur clamant pugnant de loco:

Ego interea meum non *potui* tutari locum.

The description of this scene is preceded (33-36) by a quieter narration in Perfects of the first failure.

In *Andria* 253-57 the only Historical Present is *inquit*.

¹ Cf. for the Historical Present with *extemplo*, *Captivi* 513; *Casina* 41; *Cistellaria* 182-83 and 572. Cf. also the Historical Present with *derepente*, *Mos-tellaria* 488; and with *ilico*, *Aulularia* 709; *Pseudolus* 1281; *Rudens* 62-63; *Amphitruo* 216-17 and 243; *Curculio* 349; *Adelphi* 618-19; *Eunuchus*, 576.

This is followed by an explanatory *uisust dicere*, and by *obstipui* and *obmutui* of momentary actions.

In *Phormio* 910-11 the variation is between *dehortatus est* and *inquit*.

In *Heauton Timorumenos* 768 and 772, between *dixit* and *dicit*.¹

In Varro, *de re rustica*, I, 2, 24-5, between *suscipit*, *inquit* and *coepit*.

In L. Pomponius 170-2 Perfects of single, momentary actions vary with an Historical Present of continued action:

. . . simul intro ueni, accessi ad patrem, *prendi* manum:
In terram, ut cubabat, nudam ad eum ut conquexi, interim
Mulieres *conspiciunt*.

Contrast with *interim conspiciunt* in the above passage, *interea aspexit* in Sextus Turpilius 72-4:

Ducit me secum: postquam ad aedes uenimus,
Veneratur deos, interea *aspexit* uirginem
Ibi stantem,

where the Perfect denotes an instantaneous action (caught sight of).

c. In some prologue and similar passages in Plautus, composed not so much of descriptions of dramatic scenes as of long narrations of events, a Perfect form of *sum* introduces the characters, or sets the time of the narrative, which is then given in Historical Presents, varying with other tenses.

Poenulus 59-90,² where characters are introduced by *fuere*,

¹ Contrast passages which, in the variation of Perfect and Present of verbs of saying, are at first sight similar to those quoted above, but in which the Present instead of being Historical, denotes, rather, an action that is conceived of as continuing into the present time. So *Andria* 687-8:

Orare iussit ut ad sese uenias:
Videre ait te cupere.

Cf. *Phormio* 798-99.

² On the Plautine authorship of this prologue see Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen*, p. 191.

Carthaginienses fratres patruces duo

60 *Fuere* summo genere et summis ditiis,

and a narrative concerning them follows in Historical Presents, concluding with a Perfect. Another set of characters is then introduced by another *fuere*,

83 Sed illi patruo huius qui uiuit senex

Carthaginiensi duae *fuere* filiae,

and a narrative concerning them follows in Historical Presents and one Perfect (*periere*).

In *Cistellaria* 156-96¹ the time is set by

fuere Sicyoni iam diu Dionysia,

and the narrative follows in Historical Presents and Perfects, which vary for no especial reason.

Cf. *Captiui* 7-34,² quoted below, p. 44.³

d. In some narrative passages the Historical Presents seem to express the main and important facts, while the subordinate or the connected facts are expressed by Perfects.

Curculio 682-85 :

Velut decem minas dum soluit, omnis mensas *transiit* :

Postquam nil fit, clamore hominem *posco* : ille in ius me *uocat*.

Pessime *metui*, ne mihi hodie apud praetorem solueret :

685 Verum amici *compulerunt* : *reddit* argentum domo.

Menaechmi 449-50 :

Vbi ego dum hieto, Menaechmus se *subterduxit* mihi

Atque *abit*⁴ ad amicam, credo, neque me *uoluit* ducere.

Andria 284-98 :

iam ferme moriens me *uocat* :

285 *Accessi* ; uos *semotae* ; nos soli ; *incipit*

.
.
.
.

¹ See Leo, *op. cit.*, pp. 192-3.

² See *ibid.*, pp. 184-6.

³ In *Miles Gloriosus* 99-133 (see p. 46) the Imperfect *erat* introduces a character.

⁴ Leo, *abit* after F Z ; *abit* rests upon better authority, A B D.

Hanc mi in manum *dat*; mors continuo ipsam *occupat*.
Accepi.

In *Captivi* 7-34, in the description of the fate of the two brothers, the most important fact in regard to each one is expressed by an Historical Present (note that the characters of the narration are introduced by *fuērunt*):

- 7 Seni huic *fuērunt* filii nati duo:
 Alterum quadrimum puerum seruos *surpuit*
 Eumque hinc profugiens *uendidit* in Alide—etc.;

and then:

- Postquam belligerant Aetoli cum Aleis,
 25 Vt fit in bello, *capitur* alter filius.
 Medicus Menarchus *emit* ibidem in Alide—etc.

In *Miles Gloriosus* 287-89 the variation is especially interesting because the verbs are similar:

Forte fortuna per impluuium huc *despexi* in proximum;
 Atque ego illi *aspicio* osculantem Philocomasium cum altero
 Nescioque adolescente.

It can scarcely be maintained that the difference between the Perfect and the Historical Present in this passage lies only in the character of the action denoted by each.¹

Cf. L. Pomponius 69:

Incepi contui: conspicio coleatam cuspidem.

In Sextus Turpilius 75-6 an explanatory Perfect follows an Historical Present of the main event:

Erus stupidus *adstat*: ita [enim] eius aspectus repens
 Cor *torporauit* homini amore.

In two Plautine passages the Historical Presents mark crises, as it were, in the midst of events narrated by the Perfects.

¹ Contrast *Stichus* 367 and 371 (see p. 50), where the variation of a Perfect and an Historical Present of the same verb is due to the character of the actions denoted by each: *conspicatus sum* interim (in the meantime I caught sight of), and *interibi conspicio* (meanwhile I see).

Mercator 192-203 :

Armamentis complicandis, componendis *studuimus*.
 Dum haec aguntur, lembo *aduehitur* tuos pater pauxillulo,
 Neque quisquam hominem *conspicatus*, donec in naui super.¹

.

 Postquam aspexit mulierem,

200 Rogitare *occepit*, quonia esset. Ilico
*Occurri*² atque *interpello*: matri te ancillam tuae
 Emisse illam.
 Sed scelestus subigitare *occepit*,

where the sudden appearance of the father to the consternation of the slave, and the interruption of the father by the slave at the moment when the secret is about to be discovered are marked by Historical Presents.

So in *Rudens* 366-71 the only Historical Present marks a crisis led up to by one series of Perfects, and followed by another series :

De naui timidae ambae in scapham *insiluimus*, quia uidemus
 Ad saxa nauem ferrier: properans *exsolui* restim,
 Dum illi timent. nos cum scapha tempestas dextrouorsum .
Differt ab illis. itaque nos uentisque fluctibusque
 370 *Iactatae* exemplis plurimis miserae perpetuam noctem:
 Vix hodie ad litus *pertulit* nos uentus exanimatas.

2. *The Historical Present varied with the Imperfect.*

This variation is of very rare occurrence. No examples are found in Plautus and Terence, and only one in the comic fragments.

L. Afranius 140 :

Proficiscor: res tempus locus, simul otium *hortabatur*,

where the Imperfect denotes the persisting cause.

¹ Leo, donec in navem subit.

² The MSS vary between *occurri* and *occurri*; Keil and Müller emend *occurro*.

3. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect and the Imperfect.*

a. In some passages the Imperfect describes the state or condition of its subject.

Miles Gloriosus 99–133, where a descriptive Imperfect (*erat*) introduces a character, and is followed by another Imperfect describing his condition. A simple statement of fact follows in the Perfect. Then comes a narrative which portrays by Historical Presents a succession of scenes. The Historical Presents vary with *occepit*, *perii*, and with *dedit*, which may, perhaps, denote an instantaneous action. The narrative closes with a series of Perfects of single, momentary actions, and a negatived Perfect of ordinary narration :

- Erat* erus Athenis mihi adulescens optumus.
 100 *Is amabat* meretricem matre Athenis Atticis
 Et illa illum contra: quist amor cultu optumus.
 Is publice legatus Naupactum *fuit*
 Magnai rei publicai gratia.
 Interibi hic miles forte Athenas *aduenit*.
 105 *Insinuat* sese ad illam amicam eri
Ocepit eius matri subpalparier
 Vino, ornamentis opiparisque obsoniis:
 Itaque intumum ibi se miles apud lenam *facit*.
 Vbi primum euenit militi huic occasio,
 110 *Sublinit* os illi lenae, matri mulieris
 Quam erus meus amabat. nam is illius filiam
Conicit in nauem miles clam matrem suam
 Eamque huc inuitam mulierem in Ephesum *aduehit*.
 Vbi amicam erilem Athenis auctam scio,
 115 Ego quantum uiuos possum mihi nauem *paro*:
Inscendo, ut eam rem Naupactum ad erum nuntiem.
 Vbi sumus prouecti in altum, *fit* quod di uolunt:
Capiunt praedones nauem illam ubi uectus fui.
 Prius *perii* quam ad erum ueni quo ire oceperam.
 120 Ille qui me cepit, *dat* me huic dono militi.
 Hic postquam in aedis me ad se deduxit domum,
Video illam amicam erilem Athenis quae fuit.
 Vbi contra aspexit me, oculis mihi signum *dedit*,

- Ne se appellarem. deinde, postquam occasiost,
 125 *Conqueritur* mecum mulier fortunas suas.
Ait sese Athenas fugere cupere ex hac domu:
 Sese illum amare meum erum Athenis qui fuit,
 Neque peius quemquam odisse quam istum militem.
 Ego quoniam inspexi mulieris sententiam,
 130 *Cepi* tabellas, *consignavi* clanculum,
Dedi mercatori quoidam qui ad illum deferat
 Meum erum qui Athenis fuerat, qui hanc amauerat,
 Vt is huc ueniret. is non *spreuit* nuntium.

In *Casina* 881-932 (a very corrupt passage) the three Imperfects are all forms of *sum*. The description of a scene is introduced by a Perfect and given by Historical Presents, varying with the Imperfects, with Perfects of momentary action (one is also negated), and with *fuit*, *occepi* and *coepi*. The description ends with *exeo*, in the Historical Present instead of in the more usual concluding Perfect of instantaneous action.

In *Amphitruo* 1061-71 the description of a scene is introduced by a Perfect and given by Historical Presents, one Perfect of instantaneous action, and one of ordinary narration. This narrative Perfect is explained by an Imperfect, which, by describing the condition of its subject, gives the persisting cause. The description is concluded by negated Perfects, which are outside of the direct line of the narration, and denote antecedent actions:

Ita erae meae hodie *contigit*: nam ubi parturit, deos sibi *inuocat*,
 Strepitus, crepitus, sonitus tonitrus: ut subito, ut propere, ut ualide
tonuit.

Vbi quisque institerat, *concidit* crepitu: ibi nescioquis maxuma

Voce *exclamat*: 'Alcumena, adest auxilium, ne time:

1065 Et tibi et tuis propitius coeli cultor aduenit.

Exsurgite' *inquit* 'qui terrore meo occidistis prae metu.'

Vt iacui, *exurgo*: ardere *censui* aedis: ita tum *confulgebant*.

Ibi me *exclamat* Alcumena: iam ea res me horrore *adficit*.

- Erilis *praeuortit* metus: *accurro* ut sciscam quid uelit:
 1070 Atque illam geminos filios pueros peperisse *conspicor*:
 Neque nostrum quisquam *sensimus*, quom peperit, neque *prouidimus*.

In *Phormio* 619-74 the only Imperfect (*insanibat*, 642) describes the condition of one of the characters. The scene is portrayed by Historical Presents, varying with explanatory Perfects.

In *Eunuchus* 575-603 a Perfect introduces the description of a long scene which is portrayed by Historical Presents, varying with a descriptive Imperfect (*inerat*), the Perfect *coepi*, another Imperfect descriptive of a condition (*gaudebat*), a narrative Perfect, a series of Perfects of single, instantaneous actions, hurried over, as it were, in order to get to the main point again, and a negatived Perfect, denoting an action antecedent to the action denoted by the following Historical Presents:

- 575 *traditus sum* mulieri.
 Illa ilico ubi me accepit, laeta uero ad se *abducit* domum;
Commendat uirginem. . . .
Edicit ne uir quisquam ad eam adeat, et mihi ne abscedam *inperat*;
 In interiore parte ut maneam solus cum sola. *adnuo*
 580 Terram intuens modeste. . . 'Ego' *inquit* 'ad cenam
 hinc eo':
Abducit secum ancillas; paucae, quae circum illam essent, *manent*
 Nouiciae puellae. continuo haec *adornant* ut lauet.
Adhortor properent. dum adparatur, uirgo in conclau *sedet*
 Suspectans tabulam quandam pictam; ibi *inerat* pictura haec, Iouem
 585 Quo pacto Danaae misisse aiunt quondam in gremium imbrem aureum.
 Egomet quoque id spectare *coepi*: et quia consimilem luserat
 Iam olim ille ludum, inpendio magis animus *gaudebat* mihi,
 Deum sese in hominem conuortisse atque in alienas tegulas
 Venisse clanculum per pluuium fucum factum mulieri.
 590 At quem deum! qui templa coeli summa sonitu concutit.
 Ego hoc homuncio non facerem? Ego illud uero ita *feci* ac lubens.
 Dum haec mecum reputo, *accersitur* lauatum interea uirgo:
Fit, lauit, rediit; deinde eam in lecto illae *conlocarunt*.¹
Sto expectans, siquid mi imperent. *uenit* una 'heus tu' *inquit* 'Dore,

¹ So A D G; conlocant B C E F P.

- 595 Cape hoc flabellum, uentulum huic sic facito, dum lauamus;
 Vbi nos lauerimus, si uoles, lauato.' *accipio* tristis.

 Vix *elocutast* hoc, foras simul omnes *proruunt* se,
 600 *Abeunt* lauatum, *perstrepunt*, ita ut fit, domini ubi absunt.
 Interea somnus uirginem *opprimit*. ego limis *specto*
 Sic per flabellum clanculum; simul alia *circumspecto*,
 Satin explorata sint. *uideo* esse. pessulum ostio *obdo*.

Note that the narrative, instead of being brought to a close, as is often the case, by a Perfect, is left suspended by an Historical Present. That it is unfinished is shown by the following question asked by the other member in the dialogue, "quid tum?" and the narrator's reply, "quid 'quid tum' fatue?"

b. In some passages it is the activity rather than the condition of a subject which is described by the Imperfect. The idea of continuance is always more or less prominent, as it is in any descriptive use of the Imperfect.

Captiui 500-12 :

- 500 Quid est suauius quam bene rem gerere bono publico, sicut ego *feci*
 heri,
 Quom emi hosce homines? ubi quisque uident, *eunt* obuiam
Gratulanturque eam rem. ita me miserum restitendo
 Retinendoque lassum *reddiderunt*.
 Vix ex gratulando miser iam *eminebam*.
 505 Tandem *abii* ad praetorem. ibi uix *requieui*,
Rogo syngraphum: *datur* mihi ilico: *dedi* Tyndaro: ille *abiit* domum.
 Inde ilico *reuortor*¹ domum, postquam id actumst.
 Eo protinus ad fratrem inde, mei ubi sunt alii *captiui* :
Rogo Philocratem ex Alide *ecquis* omnium
 510 Nouerit. tandem hic *exclamat* eum sibi esse sodalem.
Dico eum esse apud me: hic extemplo *orat obsecratque*,
 Eum sibi ut liceat uidere. *iussi* ilico hunc exsolui.

Here a Perfect introduces the description of a scene. Two Historical Presents follow, bringing the scene vividly before the mind. These are followed by an explanatory

¹ Leo, *praeuortor*.

Perfect of resulting action. Then comes an Imperfect, describing the slow process of extrication from the crowd (note also the negative), then an instantaneous Perfect of the final wrench. A negatived Perfect follows, before another scene is vividly brought before the mind by two Historical Presents, and its description closed by Perfects of instantaneous action. The description of another scene follows in Historical Presents and closes with a Perfect of instantaneous action.

In *Stichus* 364-71 the descriptive Imperfect (sol *superabat* 365) marks the time of the scene, which is portrayed by Historical Presents, varying with one Perfect of momentary action.¹

In *Epidicus* 209-21, 236-54 Imperfects play an important part. A festival scene is portrayed. The description opens with lively Historical Presents. Then follow more distinctly descriptive Imperfects, interrupted only by the Historical Present *uideo*. After an interval the narrative is taken up again by Perfects of ordinary narration (including *occepere*, and *abscessi* which may, perhaps, express instantaneous action), and by descriptive Imperfects, followed by a Perfect of ordinary narration and two lively Historical Presents (all verbs of saying). The narrative closes with Perfects of ordinary narration (including *coepi*) and an Imperfect (*aiebat*) :

Arma referunt et iumenta ducunt.

210 *Tum captiuorum quid ducunt secum: pueros, uirgines,*

Binos ternos alius quisque. fit concursus per uias:

Filios suos quisque uisunt.

Tum meretricum numerus tantus quantum in urbe omni fuit

Obuiam ornatae occurrebant suis quaeque amatoribus:

215 *Eos captabant!* id adeo qui maxume animum aduorterim:

Pleraeque eae sub uestimentis secum habebant retia.

Quom ad portam uenio, atque ego illam illi uideo praestolarier

¹ See above, p. 44, foot-note.

Et cum ea tibicinae *ibant* quattuor.

Ea *præstolabatur* illum apud portam.

.

Occepere aliae mulieres

Duae sic post me fabulari inter sese: ego *abscessi* sciens
 Paulum ab illis: *dissimulabam* earum operam sermoni dare:
 Nec satis *exaudibam* nec sermonis *fallebar* tamen,

- 240 Quae loquerentur. Ibi illarum altera
Dixit illi quicum ipsa ibat—
 Postquam illam sunt conspicatae, quam tuos gnatus deperit:
 ‘Quam facile et quam fortunate euenit illi, obsecro,
 Mulieri quam liberare uolt amator.’ ‘Quisnam is est?’

- 245 *Inquit* altera illi: ibi illa *nominat* Stratippoclem,

Coepti rursum uorsum ad illas pausillatim accedere,

- 250 Ibi illa *interrogauit* illam: ‘Qui scis? quis id dixit tibi?’

Haec sic *aiebat*.

In *Heauton Timorumenos* 275-307 a scene is portrayed by Historical Presents, varying with one Perfect of instantaneous action, two almost parenthetical Perfects, and three Imperfects, two of which are descriptive of activities, one of a state:

- Sv. 275 Vbi uentum ad aedis est, Dromo *pultat* fores;
 Anus quaedam *prodit*; haec ubi aperit ostium,
 Continuo hic se *coniecit* intro, ego *consequor*;
 Anus foribus *obdit* pessulum, ad lanam *redit*.
 Hic sciri *potuit* aut nusquam alibi, Clinia,
 280 Quo studio uitam suam te absente exegerit,
 Vbi de improuisost interuentum mulieri.
 Nam ea res *dedit* tum existumandi copiam
 Cottidianae uitae consuetudinem,
 Quae quouisque ingenium ut sit declarat maxume.
 285 Texentem telam studiose ipsam *offendimus*,

292 Anus

Subtemen *nebat*. praeterea una ancillula

Erat; ea texebat una, pannis obsita,

CLIN. : : : : : :
: : quid ait, ubi me nominas?

Sy. Vbi dicimus redisse te et rogare uti

305 Veniret ad te, mulier telam *desinit*

Continuo et lacrumis *opplet* os totum sibi.

In *Heauton Timorumenos* 121-46 an Imperfect sums up, as it were, and marks the continuance of the activities of a scene which is portrayed by Historical Presents. The narrative begins again with the Perfect *coepe*, and is given in Historical Presents, and a series of Perfects denoting a rapid succession of single actions:

Vbi comperi ex eis, qui fuere ei conscii,
Domum *reuortor* maestus atque animo fere
Perturbato atque incerto prae aegritudine.
Adsidio: adcurrunt serui, soccos *detrahunt*;

125 *Video* alios festinare lectos sternere,
Cenam adparare: pro se quisque sedulo
Faciebant, quo illam mihi lenirent miseriam.
Vbi uideo, haec *coepe* cogitare 'hem, tot mea
Solius solliciti sint causa, ut me unum expleant?

130 Ancillae tot me uestiant? sumptus domi
Tantos ego solus faciam? sed gnatum unicum,
Quem pariter uti his decuit aut etiam amplius,
Quod illa aetas magis ad haec utenda idoneast,
Eum ego hinc eieci miserum iniustitia mea!

135 Malo quidem me quouis dignum deputem,
Si id faciam. nam usque dum ille uitam illam colet
Inopem, carens patria ob meas iniurias,
Interea usque illi de me supplicium dabo
Laborans, parcens, quaerens, illi seruiens.'

140 Ita *facio* prorsus: nil *relinquo* in aedibus,
Nec uas nec uestimentum: *conrasi* omnia.
Ancillas, seruos, nisi eos qui opere rustico
Faciundo facile sumptum exercirent suum,
Omnis *produxi* ac *uendidi*. *inscripsi* ilico

145 Aedis mercede. quasi talenta ad quindecim
Coegi: agrum hunc *mercatus sum*.

The above passage is preceded (96-117) by an introductory narrative in Perfects and Imperfects.

In *Miles Gloriosus* 60-66 the Historical Presents are forms of *inquam*; the Imperfects are also from verbs of saying; and so also is one of the two Perfects:

reprehenderunt, dixerunt, rogabant, inquit, inquam, inquit, aiebant.

c. In other passages it is the idea of continuance in the Imperfect which is most prominent.

Aulularia 705-11, where Perfects introduce the description of a scene, an Imperfect of continued action follows, and the description is given by Historical Presents, and concluded by an explanatory Perfect:

- 705 Nam ut dudum hinc abii multo illo *adueni* prior
 Multoque prius me *conlocavi* in arborem:
 Indeque *expectabam*¹ aurum ubi abstrudebat senex.
 Vbi ille abiit, ego me deorsum *duco* de arbore:
Exfodio aulam auri plenam: inde *exeo* ilico.²
 710 *Video* recipere se senem: ille me non *uidet*.
 Nam ego *declinaui* paululum me extra uiam.

Cf. *Cistellaria* 556-85, where the Historical Presents are chiefly forms of *inquam*.

Cf. also *Pseudolus* 1270-82, where the only Imperfect is of continued action, and explanatory of a Perfect. The description of a scene is introduced by a Perfect, given by Historical Presents and Perfects (explanatory, negatived, momentary, etc.), and concluded by Perfects of momentary action:

- 1270 Illos accubantis potantis amantis
 Cum scortis *reliqui* et meum scortum ibidem
 Cordi atque animo suo opsequentis. sed postquam exurrexi
Orant me ut saltem: ad hunc modum *intuli* illi satis facete:
 Nime³ ex disciplina: quippe ego qui probe Ionicam perdidici.
 1275 Sed palliolatim amictus sic *incessi* ludibundus.
Plaudunt parum *clamitant* me ut reuortar.

¹ Leo, *spectabam*.

² Leo, inde ex eo loco
Video recipere se senem.

³ Goetz and Schoell mark as corrupt; Leo, nimis.

Ocepi denuo hoc modo: (*nolui*
Idem, amicae *dabam* me meae,
Vt me amaret). Vbi circumuortor, *cado*:

Id *fuit* naenia ludo.

Itaque dum enitor, prox, iam paene *inquinaui* pallium.

Nimiae tum voluptati edepol *fui*.

1280 Ob casum *datur* cantharus: *bibi*.

Commuto ilico pallium, illud *posui*:

Inde huc *exii*, crapulam dum amouerem.

d. In two passages the Imperfect denotes repeated action.

Menaechmi 480-84:

Ait hanc dedisse me tibi atque eam meae

Vxori surrupuisse, quoniam sentio

Errare, extemplo, quasi res cum ea esset mihi,

Coepti adsentari: mulier quicquid dixerat,

Idem ego *dicebam*.

Cf. *Andria* 923-35, where, however, the Imperfects of repetition (*aiēbat*) are out of the direct line of the narration.

In *Hecyra* 367-402 a scene is portrayed by Historical Presents, varying with Perfects of momentary action and of ordinary narration, and with three Imperfects of continued action, two of which are explanatory. The description of the scene is concluded by a Perfect of ordinary narration:¹

Postquam me aspexere ancillae aduenisse, omnes ilico

Laetae *exclamant* 'uenit', id quod me repente aspexerant.

Sed continuo uultum earum *sensi* inmutari omnium,

370 Quia tam incommode illis fors obtulerat aduentum meum.

Vna illarum interea propere *praecucurrit* nuntians

Me uenisse: ego eius uidendi cupidus recta *consequor*.

Postquam intro adueni, extemplo eius morbum *cognoui* miser;

¹ In 365 Wagner follows Poliziano's citation of the Bembinus in reading,

Nam modo intro me *corripui* timidus—

The other editors insert ut before me, thus making *corripui* a subordinate verb. According to Wagner's reading, the description of the scene portrayed in the passage quoted above is introduced in this line by a Perfect of momentary action.

- Nam neque ut celari posset tempus spatium ullum *dabat*,
 375 Neque uoce alia ac res *monebat ipsa poterat* conqueri.
 Postquam aspexi, 'o facinus indignum' *inquam* et *corripui* ilico
 Me inde lacrumans, incredibili re atque atroci percitus.
 Mater *consequitur*: iam ut limen exieram ad genua *accidit*
 Lacrumans misera: *miseritumst*. profecto hoc sic est, ut puto:
 380 Omnibus nobis ut res dant sese, ita magni atque humiles sumus.
 Hanc habere orationem mecum principio *institit*:
 'O mi Pamphile, abs te quam ob rem haec abierit causam uides;
 Nam uitiumst oblatum uirgini olim ab nescio quo inprobo.
 Nunc huc confugit, te atque alios partum ut celaret suum.'
 385 Sed quom orata huius reminiscor, nequeo quin lacrumem miser.
 'Quaeque fors fortunast' *inquit* 'nobis quae te hodie obtulit,
 Per eam te obsecramus ambae, si ius, si fas est, uti
 Aduorsa eius per te tecta tacitaque apud omnis sient.

 Pollicitus sum.

4. *The Historical Present varied with the Pluperfect.*

There is only one example of this variation.

Curculio 644-49:

- Ea me spectatum *tulerat* per Dionysia
 645 * * * * *
 Postquam illo uentumst, iam ut me collocauerat,
Exoritur uentus turbo: spectacula ibi *ruont*:
 Ego *pertimesco*: ibi me nescioquis *arripit*
 Timidam atque pauidam, nec uiuam nec mortuam,

where the Pluperfect denotes an action antecedent to the actions described by the following Historical Presents.

5. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect and the Pluperfect.*

This variation is of rare occurrence.

Mostellaria 486-92, where a scene is described by Historical Presents, varying with a Perfect of instant-

¹ This lacuna is not indicated in the MSS, but Goetz and Schoell, and Leo follow Fleckeisen in assuming it. It is possible that the passage originally contained other tenses in addition to the above Pluperfect and Historical Presents.

neous action (*condormiuius*—we fell asleep), and with a Pluperfect of an action antecedent to that of this Perfect:

Abimus omnes cubitum, condormiuius.

Lucernam forte *oblitus fueram* extinguere:

Atque ille *exclamat* derepente maxumum.

.

Ait uenisse illum in somnis ad se mortuum.

In *Eunuchus* 629-41 the only Pluperfect is of antecedent action. The Historical Presents emphasize the main events:

- Dum rus eo, *coepi* egomet mecum inter uias,
 630 Ita ut fit, ubi quid in animos molestiae,
 Aliam rem ex alia cogitare et ea omnia
 Peiorem in partem. quid opus uerbis? dum haec puto,
Praeterii imprudens uillam. longe iam *abieram*,
 Quom sensi: *redeo* rursum, male uero me habens.
 635 Vbi ad ipsum ueni deuorticulum, *constiti*:
Ocepi mecum cogitare 'hem biduum hic
 Manendumst soli sine illa? quid tum postea?
 Nil est. quid? nil? si non tangendi copias,
 Eho, ne uidendi quidem erit? si illud non licet,
 640 Saltem hoc licebit. certe extrema linea
 Amare haud nil est.' uillam *praetero* sciens.

In *Rudens* 956-59 the only Pluperfect (*noram*) is equivalent to a descriptive Imperfect.

6. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect, the Imperfect and the Pluperfect.*

This variation is of rare occurrence. It will be unnecessary to quote the passages in full, since they furnish only further illustrations of principles of variation that have already been emphasized.

So in *Rudens* 37-69¹ the narrative begins with Perfects.

The main point is brought out by an Historical Present. Perfects of ordinary narration follow, leading up to the description of a scene, which is given by

¹ Leo, *op. cit.*, pp. 191-92.

Historical Presents, and concluded by a negatived Perfect of narration. A descriptive Imperfect follows, introducing a character (*erat*).¹ Then follow the descriptions of a series of scenes, given by Historical Presents, which vary with one Perfect and a Pluperfect of antecedent action. The narrative ends with Perfects.

Cf. *Menæchmi* 17-67.²

Stichus 539-66, where, with the exception of one *dicat*, the only Historical Presents are forms of *inquam*; and all the Imperfects are forms of *sum*.

Phormio 592-99, where the second of the two Pluperfects is of instantaneous action ("Plusquamperfektum der Schnelligkeit") :

					<i>uenio</i> ad hominem, ut dicerem
					Argentum opus esse et id quo pacto fieret.
					Vix dum dimidium <i>dixeram</i> , <i>intellegerat</i> :
595					<i>Gaudebat</i> , me <i>laudabat</i> , <i>quaerebat</i> senem.
					Dis gratias <i>agebat</i> , tempus sibi dari,

	hominem ad forum
					<i>Iussi</i> opperiri.

¹ The Imperfect of the copula is interpreted throughout this dissertation as descriptive of the state or condition of its subject. It must be remarked, however, that when the verb denotes primarily existence, that is, is not accompanied by a predicate adjective (as it is in *Casina* 907 and 914), the idea of continuance is as prominent as that of description. In such passages as the above (49 *Ei erat* hospes par sui, Siculus senex) this is especially true. Cf. *Miles Gloriosus* 99, quoted above, p. 46.

² Leo, *op. cit.*, pp. 186-7.

7. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect, the Imperfect, and the Historical Infinitive.*¹

In *Amphitruo* 1091-1124 a vivid description of the birth-scene of Hercules opens with two Historical Presents. Imperfects of continued action and of description follow. Then come Perfects of ordinary narration, interrupted by an exclamatory Historical Present with which the narrator dwells fondly for a moment on the fact of the infant Hercules' strength, before recollecting herself and proceeding with the narrative. Then begins an especially vivid description of a particular part of the scene in Historical Presents, varying with rapid Historical Infinitives. The narrative closes with Perfects of ordinary narration:

Postquam parturire hodie uxor ocepit tua,
Vbi utero exorti dolores, ut solent puerperae,
Inuocat deos immortalis, ut sibi auxilium ferant,
Manibus puris, capite operto, ibi continuo *contonat*²
1095 Sonitu maximo. aedes primo ruere *rebamur* tuas:
Aedis totae *confulgebant* tuae, quasi essent aureae.
.
.
.
Dum haec aguntur, interea uxorem tuam
Neque gementem neque plorantem nostrum quisquam *audiuimus*.
1100 Ita profecto sine dolore *peperit*.
.
.
.
.
.
.

¹ In a tragic fragment there is an example of the Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect and the Historical Infinitive. See below, B, I, c. A variation between the Historical Present and the Historical Infinitive was brought about by Ritschl in *Trinummus* 835-37 by reading,

Ita iam quasi canes haud secus *circumstant* nauem turbine uenti:
Imbres fluctusque atque procellae infensae *fremere frangere* malum,
Ruere antemnas, *scindere* uela,

where the Infinitives well express haste. But the MSS read *circumstabant*, and are followed by the editors, including Goetz and Schoell in their latest text. In their former edition they read the Present with Ritschl.

² Cf. with this Historical Present *contonat*, which denotes the continued noise of the thunder, the Perfect *tonuit*, in 1062 of the same play, used of a sudden crash of thunder. See above, p. 47.

Postquam peperit, pueros lauere *iussit* nos. *occepimus*.
 Sed puer ille quem ego laui, ut *magnus* et multum *ualet*.
 Neque eum quisquam colligare *quiuit* incunabulis.

¶ 105

.

 postquam in cunas conditust,
Deuolant angues iubati deorsum inpluuium duo
 Maximi: continuo *extollunt* ambo capita . . .

1110

. sed angues oculis omnis *circumuisere*.
 Postquam pueros conspicati, *pergunt* ad cunas citi:
 Ego cunas recessim rursum uorsum *trahere* et *ducere*,
 Metuens pueris, mihi formidans, tantoque angues acrius
Persequi. postquam conspexit angues ille alter puer,

1115

Citus *e* cunis *exilit*, *facit* recta in anguis inpetum:
 Alterum altera *prehendit* eos manu perniciter.

.

 puer ambo anguis *enicat*.

1120

Dum haec aguntur, uoce clara *exclamat* uxorem tuam
 Summus imperator diuom atque hominum Iuppiter:
 Is se *dixit* cum Alcumena clam consuetum cubitibus,
 Eumque filium suum esse, qui illos angues uicerit:
 Alterum tuum esse *dixit* puerum.

In *Amphitruo* 203-60 a vivid description of a battle in mock epic style is given almost entirely by Historical Presents. The few Perfects express simple facts, or denote momentary actions. The only Imperfect is of continued action and descriptive, and the two Historical Infinitives, while closely resembling the Historical Presents, serve also to indicate the intensity of the actions that they describe:

Principio ut illo aduenimus, ubi primum terram tetigimus,
 Continuo Amphitruo *delegit* uiros primorum principes.

205

Eos *legat*: Telebois *iubet* sententiam ut dicant suam:
 Si sine ui et sine bello uelint rapta et raptore tradere,
 Si quae asportassent redderent, se exercitum extemplo domum
 Reducturum, abituros agro Argiuos, pacem atque otium
 Dare illis: sin aliter sient animati neque dent quae petat,

210

Sese igitur summa ui uirisque eorum oppidum oppugnassere.
 Haec ubi Telebois ordine iterarunt quos praefecerat
 Amphitruo, magnanimi uiri freti uirtute et uiribus
 Superbi nimis ferociter legatos nostros *increpant*,

- Respondent* bello se et suos tutari posse, proinde uti
 215 Properiter¹ de suis finibus exercitus deducerent.
 Haec ubi legati pertulere, Amphitruo castris ilico
Producit omnem exercitum: contra Teleboae ex oppido
 Legiones *educunt* suas nimis pulcris armis praeditas.
 Postquam utrimque exitumst maxuma copia,
 220 *Dispertiti* uiri, *dispertiti* ordines:
 Nos nostras more nostro et modo *instruximus*
 Legiones: item hostes contra legiones suas *instruunt*.
 Deinde utrique imperatores in medium *exeunt*,
 Extra turbam ordinum *collocuntur* simul.
 225 *Conuenit*, uicti utri sint eo proelio,
 Urbem, agrum, aras, focos seque uti dederent.
 Postquam id actumst, tubae utrimque *canunt* contra:
Consonat terra: clamorem utrimque *efferrunt*.
 Imperator utrimque hinc et illinc Iovi
 230 Vota *suscipere*, *hortari* exercitum.
 Pro se quisque id quod quisque et potest et valet
Edit, ferro *ferit*: tela *frangunt*: *boat*
 Caelum fremitu uirum: ex spiritu atque anhelitu
 Nebula *constat*: *cadunt* uolneris ui et uirum.
 235 Denique ut uoluimus, nostra *superat* manus:
 Hostes crebri *cadunt*: nostri contra *ingruunt*.
*Vicimus*² ui feroces.
 Sed fugam in se tamen nemo *conuortitur*
 Nec *recedit* loco quin statim rem gerat:
 240 Animam *omittunt* prius quam loco demigrent:
 Quisque ut steterat, *iacet optinetque* ordinem.
 Hoc ubi Amphitruo erus conspicatus est,
 Illico equites *iubet* dextera inducere.
 Equites *parent* citi, ab dextera maxumo
 245 Cum clamore *inuolant*, impetu alacri:
Foedant et *proterunt* hostium copias
 Iure inustas.
 : : : : : : : : :
 250 Perduelles *penetrant* se in fugam: ibi nostris animus *additust*.
 Vortentibus Telebois telis *complebantur* corpora,
 Ipsusque Amphitruo regem Pterelam sua *obtruncavit* manu.
 Haec illic *est pugnata* pugna usque a mani ad uesperum:
 Hoc adeo hoc commemini magis, quia illo die impransus fui.
 255 Sed proelium id tandem *diremit* nox interuentu suo.

¹ Leo, propere irent.² Leo would omit *uicimus*, after Spengel.

Postridie in castra ex urbe ad nos *ueniunt* flentes principes,
Velatis manibus *orant*, ignoscamus peccatum suum:

*Dedunt*que se, diuina humanaque omnia, urbem et liberos

In dicionem atque in arbitratum cuncti Thebano poplo.

260 Post ob uirtutem ero Amphitruoni patera *donata* aureast.

Note especially lines 221-22, where the Historical Present gives a picture of the drawing up of the enemy's forces, over against the simple statement of fact in regard to the speaker's own forces, conveyed by the Perfect. It is possible that the picture presents itself from the point of view of the Perfect itself, *i. e.*, "we drew up our forces and watched the enemy draw up theirs." However, in a passage of this kind due allowance must be made for possible metrical considerations.

In *Bacchides* 259-306 the one Historical Infinitive seems to denote haste:

Vbi portu eximus, homines remigio *sequi*,

290 Neque aues neque uenti citius.

In *Mercator* 42-106 after an introductory Perfect and Imperfects of repetition, a series of Historical Infinitives gives a hurried and vehement description of a father's anger toward his son. After an interval a reconciliation scene between father and son is portrayed by Historical Presents. A negatived Perfect of narration follows, introducing the description in Historical Presents of the lading of a vessel, the departure of the son, his arrival at his destination and the success of his enterprise. Then follows, after an introductory Perfect of instantaneous action, the description in Historical Presents, varying with an explanatory Perfect, of his interview with a friend, and his visit at the friend's house. A subsequent interview is also portrayed by Historical Presents, and the narrative then closes with two Perfects of ordinary narration:

- Amare ualide *coepi* hic meretricem. ilico
 Res exulatum ad illam clam *abibat* patris:
 Leno inportunus, dominus eius mulieris,
 45 Vi summa quicque ut poterat *rapiebat* domum.
Obiurigare pater haec noctes et dies:
 Perfidiam, iniustitiam lenonum *expromere*:
 Lacerari ualide suam rem, illius *augerier*.
 Summo haec clamore: interdum *mussans conloqui*,
 50 *Abnuere, negitare* adeo me natum suum.
Conclamitare tota urbe et *praedicere*,

 80 Ego me ubi inuisum meo patri esse intellego
 Atque odio me esse quoi placere aequom fuit,
 Amens amansque ut animum offirmo meum:
Dico esse iturum me mercatum, si uelit,
 Amorem missum facere me, dum illi obsequar.
 85 *Agit* gratias mihi atque ingenium *adlaudat* meum,
 Et mea promissa non *neglexit* persequi.
Aedificat nauem cercyrum et mercis *emit*:
 Parata naui *imponit*: praeterea mihi
 Talentum argenti ipse sua *adnumerat* manu:
 90 Seruum una *mittit*, qui olim puero paruolo
 Mihi paedagogus fuerat, quasi ut mihi foret
 Custos. his sic confectis nauem *soluimus*.
 Rhodum *uenimus* ubi quas merces uexeram
 Omnis ut uolui uendidi ex sententia:
 95 Lucrum ingens *facio* praeterquam mihi meus pater
 Dedit aestimatas merces. ita peculium
Conficio grande. sed dum in portu illi ambulo,
 Hospes me quidam *adgnouit*, ad cenam *uocat*.
Venio, decumbo, acceptus hilare atque ampliter.
 100 Discubitum noctu ut imus, ecce ad me *aduenit*
 Mulier, qua mulier alia nullast pulcrior:
 Ea nocte mecum illa hospitis iussu *fuit*.
 Vosmet uidete, quam mihi ualde placuerit:
 Postridie hospitem *adeo, oro* ut uendat mihi:
 105 *Dico* eius pro meritis gratum me et munem fore.
 Quid uerbis opus est? *emi* atque *aduexi* heri.

Cf. *Mercator* 228-63.

Cf. also *Eunuchus* 617-27, where the number of Historical Infinitives is unusually large.

In *Eunuchus* 397-433 the Historical Infinitives are of repeated actions. The only Historical Presents are forms of *inquam*, and occur in the description of typical scenes that are portrayed in order to illustrate the general narrative:

- TH. Vel rex semper maxumas
 Mihi *agebat* quidquid feceram: aliis non item.
 GN. Labore alieno magno partam gloriam
 400 Verbis saepe in se transmouet, qui habet salem;
 Quod in te est. TH. Habes. GN. Rex te ergo in oculis TH. Scilicet.
 GN. Gestare. TH. Vero: *credere* omnem exercitum,
 Consilia. GN. Mirum. TH. Tum sicubi eum satietas
 Hominum aut negoti siquando odium ceperat,
 405 Requiescere ubi uolebat, quasi . . . nostin? GN. Scio:
 Quasi ubi illam exspueret miseriam ex animo, TH. Tenes.
 Tum me conuiuiam solum *abducebat* sibi. GN. Hui,
 Regem elegantem narras. TH. Immo sic homost:
 Perpaucorum hominum. GN. Immo nullorum, arbitror,
 410 Si tecum uiuit. TH. *Inuidere* omnes mihi,
Mordere clanculum: ego non flocci *pendere*:
 Illi *inuidere* misere; uerum unus tamen
 Impense, elephantis quem Indicis praefecerat.
 Is ubi molestus magis est, 'quaeso' *inquam* 'Strato,
 415 Eon es ferox, quia habes imperium in beluas?'
 GN. Pulchre mehercle dictum et sapienter. papae,
 Iugularas hominem. quid ille? TH. Mutus ilico.
 GN. Quid ni esset? PA. Di uostram fidem, hominem perditum
 Miserumque et illum sacrilegum! TH. Quid illud, Gnatho,
 420 Quo pacto Rhodium tetigerim in conuiuiuo,
 Numquam tibi dixi? GN. Numquam; sed narra obsecro.
 Plus miliens audiui. TH. Vna in conuiuiuo
Erat hic, quem dico, Rhodius adulescentulus.
 Forte *habui* scortum: *coepit* ad id adludere
 425 Et me inridere. 'quid ais' *inquam* homini 'inpudens?
Lepus tute es, pulpamentum quaeris?' GN. hahahahae.
 TH. Quid est? GN. Facete, lepide, laute, nil supra.
 Tuomne, obsecro te, hoc dictum erat? uetus credidi.
 TH. Audieras? GN. Saepe, et fertur in primis. TH. Meumst.
 430 GN. Dolet dictum imprudenti adulescenti et libero.
 PA. At te di perdant! GN. Quid ille quaeso? TH. Perditus:
 Risu omnes qui aderant *emoriri*. denique
Metuebant omnes iam me.

Andria 51-148 is an excellent passage in which to study the variation of tenses. It contains 20 Historical Presents, 13 Historical Perfects, 18 Imperfects and 7 Historical Infinitives. After a subordinate clause, which sets the time, the narrative begins with a description in Imperfects and Historical Infinitives of the hero's manner of life. Another speaker throws in a comment with a Perfect of ordinary narration. Then a new character is introduced into the narrative by a Perfect, and her habits are described by an Imperfect. A Perfect of momentary action follows, and then an Historical Present, to mark an important fact. The hero's introduction to the new character is told by a Perfect. A succession of repeated actions is expressed by Imperfects (in their midst occurs also an explanatory descriptive Imperfect, *erat*) and also by Historical Infinitives. A quick succession of explanatory Perfects follows. Then a new and important event is marked by an Historical Present. This is followed by Imperfects of continued action, a Perfect of momentary action, and, again, Imperfects of continued action. A funeral scene is then depicted by Historical Presents, varying with Perfects of momentary action. Another scene is then described by Historical Presents, varying with a vehement Historical Infinitive. Note that the description concludes with an Historical Present, instead of the more common Perfect:

SI. Nam is postquam excessit ex ephebis [Sosia, et
Liberius uiuendi fuit potestas¹], (nam antea
Qui scire posses aut ingenium noscere,

¹ Wagner reads as follows:

Nam is postquam excessit ex ephebis, Sosia,
Librius uiuendi *fuit* potestas—nam antea,

thus bringing about an introduction of the following narrative by the Perfect.

- Dum aetas mætus magister prohibebant? So. Itast.)
- 55 Sr. Quod plerique omnes faciunt adulescentuli,
Vt animum ad aliquod studium adiungant, aut equos
Alere aut canes ad uenandum, aut ad philosophos,
Horum ille nil egregie praeter cetera
Studebat, et tamen omnia haec mediocriter.
- 60 *Gaudebam*. So. Non iniuria; nam id arbitror
Adprime in uita esse utile, ut ne quid nimis.
Sr. Sic *vita erat*: facile omnes *perferre* ac *pati*;
Cum quibus erat quomque una, eis sese *dedere*;
Eorum studiis *obsequi* [aduersus nemini,
- 65 Numquam praeponens se illis]: ita ut facillume
Sine inuidia laudem inuenias et amicos pares.
So. Sapienter uitam *instituit*; namque hoc tempore
Obsequium amicos, ueritas odium parit.
Sr. Interea mulier quaedam abhinc triennium
- 70 Ex Andro *commigravit* huc uiciniam,
Inopia et cognatorum necligentia
Coacta, egregia forma atque aetate integra.
So. Ei, uereor nequid Andria adportet mali!
Sr. Primo haec pudice uitam, parce ac duriter
- 75 *Agebat*, lana ac tela uictum quaerilans;
Sed postquam amans accessit pretium pollicens
Vnus et item alter, ita ut ingeniumst omnium
Hominum ab labore procliue ad lubidinem,
Accepit condicionem, dein quaestum *occipit*.
- 80 Qui tum illam amabant, forte, ita ut fit, filium
Perduxere illuc, secum ut una esset, meum.
Egomet continuo mecum 'certe captus est:
Habet.' *obseruabam* mane illorum seruolos
Venientis aut abeuntis: *rogitabam* 'heus puer,
- 85 Dic sodes, quis heri Chrysidem habuit?' nam Andriae
Illi id *erat* nomen. So. Teneo. Sr. Phaedrum aut Cliniam
Dicebant aut Nicaretum; nam hi tres tum simul
Amabant. 'eho, quid Pamphilus?' 'quid? symbolam
Dedit, cenauit.' *gaudebam*. item alio die
- 90 *Quaerebam*: *comperiebam* nil ad Pamphilum
Quicquam attingere. enim uero spectatum satis
Putabam et magnum exemplum continentiae;
Nam qui cum ingeniis conflictatur eius modi
Neque commouetur animus in ea re tamen,
- 95 Scias posse habere iam ipsum suae uitae modum.
Quom id mihi placebat, tum uno ore omnes omnia
Bona *dicere* et *laudare* fortunas meas,
Qui gnatum haberem tali ingenio praeditum.

- Quid uerbis opus est? hac fama impulsus Chremes
 100 Vltro ad me *uenit*, unicam gnatam suam
 Cum dote summa filio uxorem ut daret.
Placuit: despondi. hic nuptiis *dictus* dies.
 So. Quid igitur obstat, quor non fiant? Si. Audies.
 Fere in diebus paucis, quibus haec acta sunt,
 105 Chrysis uicina haec *moritur*. So. O factum bene!
 Beasti: [ei] metui a Chryside. Si. Ibi tum filius
 Cum illis, qui amarant Chrysidem, una *aderat* frequens;
Curabat una funus; tristis interim,
 Non numquam *conlacrumabat*. *placuit* tum id mihi.
 110 Sic *cogitabam* 'hic paruae consuetudinis
 Causa huius mortem tam fert familiariter:
 Quid si ipse amasset? quid hic mihi faciet patri?'
 Haec ego *putabam* esse omnia humani ingeni
 Mansuetique animi officia. quid multis moror?
 115 Egomet quoque eius causa in funus *prode*,
 Nil etiam suspicans mali. So. Hem, quid id est? Si. Scies.
Ecfertur; imus. interea inter mulieres,
 Quae ibi aderant, forte unam *aspicio* adulescentulam,
 Forma So. Bona fortasse. Si. Et uoltu, Sosia,
 120 Adeo modesto, adeo uenusto, ut nil supra.
 Quia tum mihi lamentari praeter ceteras
 Visast, et quia erat forma praeter ceteras
 Honesta ac liberali, *accedo* ad pedisequas,
 Quae sit rogo: sororem esse *aiunt* Chrysidis.
 125 *Percussit* illico animum. attat hoc illud est,
 Hinc illae lacrumae, haec illast misericordia.
 So. Quam timeo, quorsum euadas! Si. Funus interim
Procedit; sequimur; ad sepulcrum uenimus;
 In ignem *inpositast; fletur.* interea haec soror,
 130 Quam dixi, ad flammam *accessit* imprudentius,
 Satis cum periclo. ibi tum exanimatus Pamphilus
 Bene dissimulatum amorem et celatum *indicat*.
Adecurrit; mediam mulierem complectitur:
 'Mea Glycerium,' *inquit* 'quid agis? quor te is perditum?'
 135 Tum illa, ut consuetum facile amorem cerneret,
Reiecit se in eum flens quam familiariter!¹

¹ The variation of Historical Presents and Perfects in 128-136 of the funeral scene well illustrates principles of variation that have been emphasized. The picture of the funeral procession is brought before the eyes by Historical Presents. The arrival and the placing of the body on the pyre are narrated by Perfects, as necessary but unimportant details, hurried over, as it were, in order to get to the main point. The mourning that meantime is going on is depicted by an Historical

SO. Quid ais? SI. *Redeo* inde iratus atque aegre ferens;
Nec satis ad obiurgandum causae.

.

Venit Chremes postridie ad me clamitans:

- 145 Indignum facinus; comperisse, Pamphilum
Pro uxore habere hanc peregrinam. ego illud sedulo
Negare factum. ille *instat* factum. denique
Ita tum *discedo* ab illo, ut qui se filiam
Neget daturum.

Cf. also *Eunuchus* 512-29.¹

8. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect, the Imperfect, the Pluperfect, and the Historical Infinitive.*

Phormio 71-135 is a very good narrative passage.

The narrative begins with an Historical Present of an important fact, and continues in Perfects of ordinary narration, Imperfects of description and of continued action, and a Pluperfect of antecedent action. In 91-103 a scene is described by Historical Presents and one Historical Infinitive. In 103-110 the description of another scene is introduced by a Perfect, marking an event closely connected with the concluding event of the previous scene, and given by Historical Presents, varying with a descriptive Imperfect. A remark is

Present. The approach of the girl too near the flames is narrated by a Perfect, as an instantaneous action, or, perhaps, an action suddenly observed by the spectator. Her rescue by the hero is vividly described by Historical Presents, and then the impulsiveness with which she throws herself into his arms is well indicated by a Perfect of instantaneous action.

¹ Grysar, *op. cit.*, quotes the Historical Infinitives in this passage as denoting repeated action, but they are, rather, descriptive of particular events enacted at a particular time:

- Vbi ueni, causam, ut ibi manerem, *repperit*:
Ait rem diuinam fecisse et rem seriam
Velle agere mecum. iam tum *erat* suspicio
515 Dolo malo haec fieri omnia. ipsa *ad*cumbere
Mecum, mihi sese *dare*, sermonem *quaerere*.

thrown in by another speaker with the Perfect *coepit*. Then in 112-116 still another scene is described by Historical Presents, and an Historical Infinitive and descriptive Imperfects follow. Another speaker asks a question in an Historical Present and follows it with a similar question in a Perfect. The answer is given by a Perfect of ordinary narration. The narrative concludes with a series of Perfects, denoting a rapid succession of single events, and with an Historical Present of a more continued state :

- GE. Abeuntes ambo hinc tum senes me filiis
Relinquent quasi magistrum. DA. O Geta, prouinciam
 Cepisti duram. GE. Mi usus uenit, hoc scio:
 Memini relinqui me deo irato meo.
- 75 *Coepti* aduorsari primo: quid uerbis opust?
 Seni fidelis dum sum, scapulas *perdidi*.
Venere in mentem mi istaec: namque inscitiast,
 Aduorsum stimulum calces. *Coepti* eis omnia
 Facere, obsequi quae uellent. DA. Scisti uti foro.
- 80 GE. Noster mali nil quicquam primo; hic Phaedria
 Continuo quandam *nactus est* puellulam
 Citharistriam, hanc amare *coepit* perditae.
Ea seruiebat lenoni inpurissimo,
 Neque quod daretur quicquam; id *curarant* patres.
- 85 *Restabat* aliud nil nisi oculos pascere,
 Sectari, in ludum ducere et reducere.
 Nos otiosi operam *dabamus* Phaedriae.
 In quo haec discebat ludo, exaduorsum ilico
 Tonstrina *erat* quaedam: hic *solebamus* fere
- 90 Plerumque eam opperiri, dum inde iret domum.
 Interea dum sedemus illi, *interuenit*
 Adulescens quidam lacrumans. nos *mirarier*;
Rogamus quid sit. 'numquam aequae' *inquit* 'ac modo
 Paupertas mihi onus uisumst et miserum et graue.
- 95 Modo quandam uidi uirginem hic uiciniae
 Miseram suam matrem lamentari mortuam.
 Ea sita erat exaduorsum, neque illi beniuolus
 Neque notus neque cognatus extra unam aniculum
 Quisquam aderat, qui adiutaret funus: miseritumst.
- 100 Virgo ipsa facie egregia.' quid uerbis opust?
Commorat omnis nos. ibi continuo Antipho
 'Voltisne eamus uisere?' alius 'censeo:

- Eamus: duc nos sodes.' *imus, uenimus,*
Videmus. uirgo pulchra, et quo magis diceres,
 105 Nil *aderat* adiumenti ad pulchritudinem:
 Capillus passus, nudus pes, ipsa horrida,
 Lacrumae, uestitus turpis: ut, ni uis boni
 In ipsa inesset forma, haec formam extinguerent.
 Ille qui illam amabat fidicinam, tantum modo
 110 'Satis' *inquit* 'scitast'; noster uero... DA. Iam scio:
 Amare *coepit.* GE. Scin quam? quo euadat uide.
 Postridie ad anum recta *pergit: obsecrat,*
 Vt sibi eius faciat copiam. illa enim se *negat*
 Neque eum aequom *ait* facere: illam ciuem esse Atticam,
 115 Bonam bonis prognatam: si uxorem uelit,
 Lege id licere facere; sin aliter, *negat.*
 Noster quid ageret *nescire:* et illam ducere
Cupiebat et metuebat absentem patrem.
 DA. Non, si redisset, ei pater ueniam daret?
 120 GE. Ille indotatam uirginem atque ignobilem
 Daret illi? numquam faceret. DA. Quid *fit* denique?
 GE. Quid fiat? est parasitus quidam Phormio,
 Homo confidens: qui illum di omnes perduint.
 DA. Quid is *fecit?* GE. Hoc scilium quod dicam *dedit:*
 125 'Lex est ut orbae, qui sunt genere proxumi,
 Eis nubant, et illos ducere eadem haec lex iubet.
 Ego te cognatum dicam et tibi scribam dicam;
 Paternum amicum me adsimulabo uirginis:
 Ad iudices ueniamus: qui fuerit pater,
 130 Quae mater, qui cognata tibi sit, omnia haec
 Confinгам: quod erit mihi bonum atque commodum,
 Quom tu horum nil refelles, uincam scilicet.
 Pater aderit: mihi paratae lites: quid mea?
 Illa quidem nostra erit.' DA. Iocularum audaciam.
 135 GE. *Persuasumst* homini: *factumst: uentumst: uincimur.*

In *Hecyra* 114-191 the variation of tenses follows similar principles. The narrative contains Historical Presents of vivid portrayal and of important facts; Perfects of ordinary narration; Imperfects of continued and of repeated action;¹ a Pluperfect of antecedent action; and Historical Infinitives of repeated and of intense action.

¹ In 172 from the *redibat* and *rediebat* (read by Dziatzko) of the MSS Fleckeisen conjectures *redierat*. He is followed by Wagner.

In concluding the examination of the Historical Present in colloquial literature its use in Varro deserves attention. His *de re rustica* is cast in the form of dialogues. The activities of the speakers in these dialogues are described throughout by Historical Presents, with only occasional Historical Perfects. Thus, forms of *inquam* occur 79 times, and other verbs, such as *aio*, *suscipio*, *subicio*, *adicio*, *aspicio*, *redeo*, *surgo*, etc., not infrequently. The general effect is to represent the scenes of the conversations vividly, as if they were going on before the eyes, but the use of *inquam* is chiefly phraseological.

B.

1. The remains of early tragic poetry show the following variations:

- a. The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect.*

Attius 636-39, where the Historical Present seems to begin the description of some scene, while the immediate relation between it and the Perfect is that of effect and cause respectively. Note also the momentary character of the Perfect:

Tereus indomito more atque animo barbaro
Conspexit eam: hinc amore uecors flammeo,
 Depositus facinus pessimum ex dementia
Confingit.

- b. The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect and the Imperfect.*

Incert. (Ennius?), *Incert.* 5-14:¹

. mater grauida parere se ardentem facem
Visa est in somnis Hecuba: quo fato pater

¹ Ribbeck suggests that the above fragment probably belongs to the prologue of the tragedy *Alexander*, by Ennius. He is followed by Vahlen and by L. Mueller.

- Rex ipse Priamus somnio, mentis metu
 Perculsus, curis sumptus suspirantibus,
 5 *Ecsacrificabat* hostiis balantibus.
 Tum coniecturam *postulat* pacem petens,
 Vt se edoceret obsecrans Apollinem,
 Quo sese uertant tantae *sortes* somnium.
 Ibi ex oraclo uoce diuina *edidit*
 10 Apollo.

Here the first Perfect gives the cause for the consultation of the oracle, the scene of which event is portrayed by the following Imperfect, denoting the continued process of the preliminary act of sacrifice; Historical Present, giving the main fact of the consultation; and Perfect, stating in simple narration the fact that the oracle answered.

c. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect and the Historical Infinitive.*

Attius 437-8, where a series of Perfects denotes a rapid succession of single actions; an Historical Present brings vividly before the eyes a resulting action; and an Historical Infinitive well expresses haste:

Constitit cognouit sensit, conlocat sese in locum
 Celsum: hinc manibus *rapere* raudus saxeum grande et graue.

2. The remains of early epic poetry show the following variations:

a. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect.*

Livius Andronicus, *Odysseia* 28-30, where the Perfect introduces the description of a scene which is portrayed by Historical Presents:

Topper citi ad auris *uenimus* Circae;
 Simul *aduenit*, seruæ *portant* ad nauis
 Edulia alma, uina isdem *inferinuntur*.

Ennius, *Annales* 52, where the Historical Present expresses the effect of the cause denoted by the narrative Perfect and seems to begin or to form a part of the description of some scene :

Haec cefatus; ibique latrones dicta facessunt.

In *Annales* 348-51 the Perfect follows and is explanatory.

In *Annales* 464 the Historical Present again forms a part of the description of some scene, but the following Perfect expresses the resulting action and its instantaneous character :

Concidit; et sonitum simul insuper arma dedere.

b. *The Historical Present varied with the Imperfect.*

Naevius, *Bellum Punicum* 4-5, where the Historical Present describes a scene, and the Imperfect the continued process of an act of sacrifice :

Sacra in mensa Penatium ordine ponuntur.

Tum victimam immolabat auream pulchram.

Ennius, *Annales* 188-92, where the Imperfect denotes the continuance of one activity which accompanies the progress of the other activities that make up the scene and are described by Historical Presents :

Incedunt arbusta per alta, securibu' caedunt,

Percellunt magnas quercus, exciditur ilex,

190 *Fraxinu' frangitur atque abies consternitur alta,*

Pinus proceras pervortunt. omne sonabat

Arbustum fremitu silvai frondosai.

Cf. *Annales* 450-57, a passage which is very similar to the preceding passage, but in which the Imperfect denotes, rather, the continuance of effort :

450 *Undique conveniunt velut imber tela tribuno,*

Configunt parmam, tinnit hastilibus umbo,

Aerato sonitu galeae. sed nec pote quisquam

Undique nitendo corpus discerpere ferro.

Semper adundantes hastas frangitque quatitque.

455 *Totum sudor habet corpus multumque laborat,*

Nec respirandi *fit* copia: praepete ferro
 Histri tela manu iacientes *sollicitabant*.

c. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect, and the Imperfect.*

Ennius, *Annales* 32-44, where a Perfect introduces the description of a scene; Imperfects of description and of continued action follow; an Historical Present gives the main event of the scene; and Perfects of instantaneous action conclude the description:

- Nam me *visus* homo pulcher per amoena salicta
 Et ripas raptare locosque novos. ita sola
 Postilla, germana soror, errare *videbar*
 35 Tardaue vestigare et quaerere te neque posse
 Corde capessere: semita nulla pedem *stabilibat*.
 Exim compellare pater me voce *videtur*
 His verbis: "o gnata, tibi sunt ante ferendae
 Aerumnae, post ex fluvio fortuna resistet."
 40 Haec ecfatu' pater, germana, repente *recessit*
 Nec sese *dedit* in conspectum corde cupitus,
 Quamquam multa manus ad caeli caerula templa
 Tendebam lacrumans et blanda voce vocabam.
 Vix aegro cum corde meo me somnu' *reliquit*.

Note especially (32, 34, 37) the variation in the tenses of the same verb.

Annales 73-93, where, in the description of a scene, the Imperfects denote the continuance of effort, and there seems to be no especial reason for the variation of the Historical Presents and the Perfects:

- Curantes magna cum cura tum cupientes
 Regni *dant* operam simul auspicio augurioque.
 75 Interea sol albu' *recessit* in infera noctis.
 Hinc in monte Remus * * * *
 * * * auspicio se *devovet* atque secundam
 Solus avem *servat*. at Romulu' pulcher in alto
Quaerit Aventino laevum genus altivolantum.
 80 *Certabant*, urbem Romam Remoramne vocarent.
 Omnibu' cura viris, uter esset induperator.
Exspectant veluti, consul cum mittere signum
 Volt, omnes avidi spectant ad carceris oras,

- Quam mox emittat pictis e faucibu' currus:
 85 Sic *expectabat* populus atque ora *tenebat*
 Rebus, utri magni victoria sit data regni.
 Exin candida se radiis *dedit* acta foras lux;
 Et simul ex alto longe pulcherruma praepes
 Laeva *volavit* avis, simul aureus *exoritur* sol.
 90 *Cedunt* de caelo ter quattor corpora sancta
 Avium, praepetibus sese pulcrisque locis *dant*.
Conspicit inde sibi data Romulus esse propritim
 Auspicio regni stabilita scamna solumque.

Note especially (82 and 85) the variation between the Historical Present and the Imperfect of the same verb. The Historical Present brings before the eyes a picture of the waiting people, the vividness of which is still further enhanced by the following simile. The Imperfect takes up the same act of waiting, and describes its continued character.

3. The remains of early satire show the following variations :

a. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect.*

Ennius, *Saturae* 9-12, where, in an almost epic description, a series of Perfects of momentary actions closes with a vivid Historical Present of a continued state :

- * mundus caeli vastus *constitit* silentio,
 10 Et Neptunus saevus undis asperis pausam *dedit*,
 Sol equis iter *repressit* unguis volantibus,
Constitere omnes perennes, arbores vento *vacant*.

b. *The Historical Present varied with the Imperfect.*

Lucilius, *Saturae* 1017, where an Imperfect of continued action and description is followed by an Historical Present which brings a scene vividly before the eyes :

Ibat forte domum. *sequimur* multi atque frequentes.

4. The remains of early historical literature show the following variations :

a. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect.*

L. Cassius Hemina 11, where the narration by a Perfect of an ordinary historical event is followed by the description in Historical Presents of an extraordinary event :

Pastorum uulgus sine contentione consentiendo *praefecerunt* aequaliter imperio Remum et Romulum, ita ut de regno pararent inter se. monstrum *fit*: sus *parit* porcos triginta.

L. Coelius Antipater 44, where there seems to be no especial reason for the variation :

Ipse regis eminus equo *ferit* pectus aduersum, *congenualat* percussus, *deiecit* dominum.

Cf. Q. Claudius Quadrigarius 76 :

Contione dimissa Metellus in Capitolinu *uenit* cum mortalibus multis. inde domum *proficiscitur*, tota ciuitas eum *reduxit*.

In *ibid.* 56 the Perfect expresses the result of the Historical Present which denotes the main event :

Artorius Taureae dextrum umerum *sauciat* atque ita *resiluit*.

b. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect and the Imperfect.*

Q. Claudius Quadrigarius 10, where the only Imperfect is negated and descriptive of a continued state, and a large number of Perfects of instantaneous action and of ordinary narration vary, apparently for no especial reason, with a few Historical Presents :

Cum interim Gallus quidam nudus praeter scutum et gladios duo torque atque armillis decoratus processit, qui et uiribus et magnitudine et adulescentia simulque uirtute ceteris antistabat. is maxime proelio commoto atque utrisque summo studio pugnantibus manibus significare *coepit* utrisque, quiescerent. pugnae *facta* pausa est. extemplo silentio facto cum uoce maxima *conclamat*, si quis secum depugnare uellet, uti prodiret. nemo *audebat* propter magnitudinem atque

inmanitatem facies. deinde Gallus inridere *coepit* atque linguam exertare. Id subito *perdolitum est* cuidam Tito Manlio, summo genere gnato, tantum flagitium ciuitati addidere, e tanto exercitu neminem prodire. is, ut dico, *processit* neque *passus est* uirtutem Romanam ab Gallo turpiter spoliari. scuto pedestri et gladio Hispanico cinctus contra Gallum *constitit*. Metu magno ea congressio in ipso ponti utroque exercitu inspectante *facta est*. ita, ut ante dixi, *constiterunt*: Gallus sua disciplina scuto proiecto cunctabundus, Manlius, animo magis quam arte confisus, scuto scutum *percussit* atque statum Galli *conturbauit*. dum se Gallus iterum eodem pacto constituere studet, Manlius iterum scuto scutum *percutit* atque de loco hominem iterum *deiecit*; eo pacto ei sub Gallicum gladium *successit*, ne Gallus impetum in ictu haberet, atque Hispanico pectus *hausit*, deinde continuo humerum dextrum eodem congressu *incidit* neque *recessit* usquam, donec subuertit. Vbi eum euertit, caput *praecidit*, torquem *detraxit* eamque sanguinolentam sibi in collum *imponit*.

The fragments cited above are too few and too slight to serve as a basis for any very certain conclusions. From the investigation of them, however, it may be justifiable to infer that the use of the Historical Present in ante-classical literature was a natural development of its use, so far as it has been possible to trace this use, in the spoken language. In tragic and in epic poetry, especially, much the same principles seem to govern the variation of tenses as in the comic poets. In the historians it may be possible to find the aoristic use of the Historical Present as nearly equivalent to the Historical Perfect more clearly developed, although even the few existing fragments contain examples of the distinctly vivid use of the tense.

It should further be noted that from the fragments of tragic and of epic poetry, of the satire and of history, and also from the fragments of comic poetry may be gathered a large number of Historical Presents, varying with no other tenses.¹ In the original contexts, however, such variation doubtless occurred.

¹ From the comic fragments, 19; from the tragic, 28; from the epic, 85; from the satiric, 13; from the historical, 25.

CHAPTER IV.

The Historical Present in Subordinate Clauses.

The preceding chapters in treating of the Historical Present in principal clauses have treated of its most important use. But the study of the tense will not be complete unless the Historical Present in subordinate clauses be examined, and also the sequence of tenses after the Historical Present. Subjunctive subordinate clauses, which depend directly upon their principal clauses, follow the principles of the "sequence of tenses", and must be distinguished from indicative subordinate (or coördinate) clauses, such as indicative relative, causal, and temporal clauses,¹ the tenses of which are independent of the tenses of the principal verbs. The present chapter will treat of the Historical Present in these indicative subordinate clauses, while the following chapter will deal with the sequence of subjunctive tenses after the Historical Present.

The various explanations that have been advanced of the function of the Historical Present in subordinate clauses accord with the various theories of its function in principal clauses. Holtze and Kühner include in their general definition of the tense its use in both kinds of clauses, and thus imply that in subordinate as well as in principal clauses it is aoristic in character and may vary

¹Cf. Hoffmann, *Zeitfolge nach dem Praesens historicum*, p. 19. He, however, classes indicative relative clauses under those subordinate clauses that follow the principles of the sequence of tenses, distinguishing them, together with others, as "Nebensätze, die durch ihre Zeitlage bestimmend sind für die Aussage des Hauptsatzes", from subjunctive subordinate clauses, which he calls "Nebensätze, deren Zeitlage bedingt ist durch die Aussage des Hauptsatzes". (pp. 25, 32-42).

arbitrarily with the Historical Perfect.¹ The explanation of the use of the Historical Present in subordinate clauses that results from Hoffmann's theory of the nature of the tense in principal clauses is illustrated by Lange, who maintains² that, owing to the imperfect character of the Historical Present, its use in subordinate clauses distinctly differs from that of the Historical Perfect: "Omnis nimirum actio triplici modo ex altera apta esse potest: ut aut ante alteram ipsa iam plane absoluta sit (*nachdem*), aut eodem, quo altera, tempore conficiatur ab eodemque principio profecta communem quoque rei exitum ostendat (*zugleich als*), aut confecta demum altera absolvatur (*waehrend*). Atque proximum quidem genus totum praesenti historico obtigit, cetera perfecto iusta ratione concessa sunt. Praesens enim id tantum declarat actionem aliquam durare nequedum perfectam esse, ipsius vero temporis, quo quid conficiatur, notionem non accuratius circumscribit."³ And again, "Particula *dum* iuncta cum praes. hist. eiusmodi proprie indicat actionem, quae antequam altera confici sit incepta, iam dudum in conspectu versetur; itaque saepe ad tales refertur voces, quales *interca*, *interim*, etc. Cum vero exprimendum est rem aliquam paullo post alteram evenisse, ad particulas *postquam*, *quoniam*, *quom*, *ubi*, *ut* recurritur, quibus simili ratione respondent vocabula *subito*, *eloco*, *extemplo*, etc. Singularis tamen praesentis historici vis et natura nunquam obliteratur, immo integra semper permanet; neque enim

¹ Kühner specifies no kinds of subordinate clauses, but says that the Historical Present is used "besonders in Hauptsätzen, aber auch nicht selten in Nebensätzen". *Op. et loc. cit.* See Chapter I, p. 1. Holtze restricts it especially to temporal clauses: "Praesens historicum aut per se ponitur aut pendens a variis particulis, imprimis temporis." *Op. cit.*, p. 64.

² *De sententiarum temporalium apud priscos scriptores Latinos syntaxi*, Vratislaviae, 1878.

³ p. 4.

iisdem, quibus altera actio, cancellis sese continet, sed ultra pertinens etiam longius extenditur.”¹

Schneider alone seems to deny the existence of the Historical Present in subordinate clauses. Upon the erroneous distinction between so-called “absolute” and “relative” time he bases a theory that the present tense in these clauses that is used of past events is not the Historical Present, but only a relative present.²

An examination of the Historical Present in subordinate clauses in early Latin seems to point conclusively to a function and an usage similar to the function and the usage in principal clauses that have been indicated in the foregoing chapters. In subordinate as in principal clauses the tense serves to vividly represent the past, is used of both aoristic and imperfect conceptions, and varies with the Historical Perfect, the Imperfect and the Pluperfect, for the most part according to certain principles, which find their explanation in the relation of these subordinate clauses to their principal clauses and to the context in general, rather than in their relation to each other.

The chief interest centres about the Historical Present in temporal clauses. Relative clauses are much less

¹ pp. 7-8.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 12: “ut recte Langius disseruit, praesens cum particulis dum, postquam, quoniam, quom, ubi, ut coniunctum semper actionem praeteritam significat, quae eodem tempore durat nequedum absoluta est, quo altera aut plane aut ex parte conficitur. Minime vero hoc cum absoluto praesentis historici genere confundendum esse video. Nam etsi illae particulae imprimis in narrationis tenore, in quo praes. hist. etiam in sententiis primariis locum habet, cum praesenti constructae inveniuntur, tamen hanc structuram certo consilio adhibitam esse apparet ad indicandum temporum relationem. Ut enim supra vidimus, praesentis historici quod proprie dicitur in comicorum sermone minime proprie est vis actionis continuatae, sed saepe etiam de rebus brevissimo temporis momento peractis neque ullo perfecti discrimine usurpatur. Quodsi tantummodo in sententiis temporalibus, ubicumque praesens legitur, certam illam et constantem regulam, ut enuntiati primarii actio alterius tempore contineatur, videmus esse observatam, in iis praesens relativa quadam vi positum esse elucet.”

closely connected with their principal clauses and with the context. Often they are used to express only explanatory or parenthetical facts, which have no real interconnection with the events that the speaker is reviewing, or to denote facts that, while they are a necessary part of the scene, yet serve rather as a background for the main activities, which are described by Historical Presents in the principal clauses. Therefore, as should be expected, the Historical Present occurs but rarely in relative clauses, while the Historical Perfect and other past tenses, depending upon an Historical Present in the principal clause, are far more common. Over against ten examples of the Historical Present stand forty examples of past tenses. Much the same is true of causal clauses. Of the small number of such clauses three show an Historical Present after a past tense in the principal clause, while five show a past tense after an Historical Present in the principal clause. The facts expressed by these past tenses are explanatory of the main facts. In the case of the Historical Presents emphasis is laid upon the cause itself.

In temporal clauses, on the other hand, the Historical Present plays an important part, since the activities denoted by the verbs in these clauses are integral parts of the scene that the speaker is describing. In relation to the principal verb the subordinate Historical Present may be used of either antecedent or contemporary time, according to its introductory particle. And as in principal clauses so in these subordinate clauses the Historical Present often varies with other tenses. There are eighty-five examples of the Historical Present, over against forty-four examples of the Historical Perfect, two of the Imperfect, and four of the Pluperfect. Here are considered temporal clauses introduced by *postquam*, *quoniam*, *quom*, *ubi*, *ut*, *prius-*

quam, and *donec*. The Present with *dum* in such clauses, although usually explained as the Historical Present, seems rather to go back directly to the original Present.¹ In view, however, of the doubt in regard to their nature, the *dum* clauses will be included in the following citations.

In support of the claim made above, that the use of the Historical Present in subordinate clauses is dependent only upon the nature of the tense itself, it will be well to point out the inadequacy of two other explanations which might suggest themselves.

Even in such sentences as those now under consideration, it is sometimes claimed that the tense in the subordinate clause depends upon the position of this clause in relation to its principal clause in such a way that when the subordinate clause follows an Historical Present in the principal clause, its verb naturally tends towards the Historical Present, while, on the contrary, when it precedes its verb, it naturally tends towards the past tenses, the idea of the representation of the past not yet having been introduced. How entirely this principle fails to explain the use of the Historical Present in subordinate clauses in early Latin will appear from the following tabular statements, in which are included subordinate Historical Presents combined with principal Historical Presents and with past tenses; and subordinate past tenses combined with principal Historical Presents:

¹ Schmalz, Reisig's *Vorlesungen*, III, p. 341, and *Lateinische Syntax*, p. 509, follows Hoffmann (*Die Construction der lateinischen Zeitpartikeln*) in explaining the Present with *dum* as an Historical Present. Kühner, *op. cit.*, II, p. 910, Draeger, *op. cit.*, II, p. 604, Roby, *Latin Grammar*, II, § 1458, and others give the same explanation. Riemann, on the contrary, *Syntaxe Latine*, p. 372, justly maintains that the use of *postquam*, *ubi* and *ut* with the Historical Present for the sake of enlivening a narrative must not be confounded with the use of *dum* (meaning, not "during the entire time that", but "at the same time that") with the Present, which is the only regular construction of this particle.

TEMPORAL SENTENCES.

<i>postquam</i>	<i>subordinate clause pre- cedes principal</i>	<i>subordinate clause fol- lows principal</i>
Historical Present.... 15 12	3 (1 principal clause
Historical Perfect.... 27 26	1 contains a past
Pluperfect 1 1 tense.)
—	—	—
43 39	4
<i>quoniam</i>		
Historical Present.... 14 9	5 (3 principal clauses
Historical Perfect.... 2 1	1 contain a past
—	—	— tense.)
16 10	6
<i>quom</i>		
Historical Present.... 22 10	9 (all principal clauses
(3 principal clauses are wanting.)		contain a past
<i>ubi</i>		tense.)
Historical Present.... 30 29	
(one principal clause is wanting.)		
Historical Perfect.... 17 17	
—	—	
47 46	
<i>ut</i>		
Historical Present.... 1 1	
Historical Perfect.... 6 6	
Imperfect 2 2	
Pluperfect 3 3	
—	—	
12 12	
<i>priusquam</i>		
Historical Present.... 2 1 1
<i>donec</i>		
Historical Present.... 1	1 (principal clause con- tains a past tense.)
<i>dum</i>		
Historical Present.... 52 38	14 (13 principal clauses contain a past tense.)

Exclusive of the *dum* sentences this table shows 143 temporal sentences, in 118 of which the subordinate precedes the principal clause; in 21 of which the subordinate follows the principal clause; in four of which the principal clause is wanting. It also shows that in 14 of the 19 cases in which the subordinate Historical Present follows the principal clause this clause contains a past tense.

RELATIVE SENTENCES.

<i>pronoun</i>	<i>subordinate clause pre-</i> <i>cedes principal</i>	<i>subordinate clause fol-</i> <i>lows principal</i>
Historical Present.... 6 3 3
Historical Perfect.... 13 5 8
Imperfect..... 9 4 5
Pluperfect.... 7 1 6
35 13 22
<i>adverb</i>		
Historical Present.... 4 3 1
Historical Perfect.... 7 4 3
Imperfect..... 4 2 2
Pluperfect.... 1 1
16 10 6

This table shows 51 relative sentences, in 23 of which the subordinate precedes the principal clause; in 28 of which the subordinate follows the principal clause.

CAUSAL SENTENCES.

<i>quia</i>	<i>subordinate clause pre-</i> <i>cedes principal</i>	<i>subordinate clause follows</i> <i>principal</i>
Historical Present.. .2 1	1 (principal clause contains a past tense.)
Historical Perfect.... 1 1	
Imperfect..... 1 1	
4 3	
<i>quod</i>		
Imperfect..... 1 1
Pluperfect 1 1
2 2
<i>propterea quod</i>		
Imperfect..... 1 1

This table shows 7 causal sentences, in 3 of which the subordinate precedes the principal clause; in 4 of which the subordinate follows the principal clause.

The above tables show: (1) that by far the larger number of subordinate clauses precede their principal

clauses; (2) that in these preceding subordinate clauses the Historical Present and Historical Perfect and other past tenses occur indiscriminately; and (3) that in the majority of cases in which the subordinate Historical Present follows, the principal clause contains a past tense, not an Historical Present.

In temporal sentences the subordinate Historical Present will be seen to predominate, in spite of the fact that most of the subordinate clauses precede their principal clauses. In relative sentences it is noticeable that more than half of the few Historical Presents precede their principal clause, while in the relative clauses that follow a principal Historical Present the past tenses are predominant. In causal sentences one of the two subordinate Historical Presents precedes a past tense in the principal clause, while of the five subordinate past tenses three follow an Historical Present in the principal clause.

A more detailed examination of the relation of subordinate and principal clauses makes plain another important fact, namely, that the Historical Present in the subordinate clauses cannot be explained by attraction. Out of eighty-one examples of the subordinate Historical Present in temporal sentences thirty-seven show a past tense in the principal clause; while there are fifty-eight examples of a past tense in the subordinate clause with an Historical Present in the principal. In relative sentences there are thirty and in causal sentences five examples of a subordinate past tense with a principal Historical Present. The following tables will make this clear:

TEMPORAL SENTENCES.

1. *Historical Present in the subordinate; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

<i>postquam</i>	<i>quoniam</i>	<i>quom</i>	<i>ubi</i>	<i>ut</i>	<i>prinsquam</i>	<i>dum</i>
Plautus 3	Plautus 6	Plautus 2	Plautus	Plautus 1	Plautus 1	Plautus 8
Terence 2	Terence 3	Terence 3	Terence	10		Terence 4
C. Statius 1	Attius 1	Attius 1	S. Turpilus 1	1		Ennius 1
L. Afranius 1	—	—	Ennius 2	2		Q. C. Quadri- garius 2
—	—	6	Q. C. Quadri- garius 1	1		— 15
7			—	23		

Total, exclusive of *dum* sentences: 44.

85

2. *Historical Present in the subordinate; Historical Perfect in the principal clause.*

<i>postquam</i>	<i>quoniam</i>	<i>quom</i>	<i>ubi</i>	<i>prinsquam</i>	<i>donec</i>	<i>dum</i>
Plautus 3 ¹	Plautus 8	Plautus 2	Plautus 2	Plautus 1	Plautus 1	Plautus 15
Terence 4	Terence 1	Terence 1	Terence 3			Terence 17
—	—	—	—			S. Turpilus 1
7	3	3	5			L. Pomponius 1
						— 34

Total, exclusive of *dum* sentences: 25.

¹ The principal tense in two of these sentences is a pure rather than an historical Perfect.

3. *Historical Present in the subordinate; Imperfect in the principal clause.*

<i>postquam</i>		<i>quom</i>		<i>dum</i>	
Terence	1	Plautus	5	Terence	1
		Terence	2	Lucilius	1
			—		—
			7		3

Total, exclusive of *dum* sentences: 8.4. *Historical Present in the subordinate; Pluperfect in the principal clause.*

<i>quom</i>		<i>dum</i>	
Plautus	1	Ennius	1
Terence	2		
	—		
	3		

5. *Historical Present in the subordinate; Historical Infinitive in the principal clause.*

	<i>ubi</i>			
	Plautus	1		

6. *Historical Perfect in the subordinate; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

<i>postquam</i>	<i>quoniam</i>	<i>ubi</i>	<i>ut</i>
Plautus 19	Plautus 2	Plautus	9 Plautus
Terence 5		Terence	6 Terence
S. Turpilus 1		Lucilius	1
Naevius 1		Q. C. Quadri-	
Ennius 1		garius	1
			17
	27		

Total: 52.

7. *Imperfect in the subordinate; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

<i>ut</i>	
Plautus	1
Terence	1
	<hr/>
	2

8. *Pluperfect in the subordinate; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

<i>postquam</i>		<i>ut</i>	
Plautus	1	Plautus	1
		Terence	2
			<hr/>
			3

Total: 4.

RELATIVE SENTENCES.

1. *Historical Present in the subordinate; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

<i>pronoun</i>		<i>adverb</i>	
Plautus	3	Plautus	2
Ennius	2	Terence	1
Coel. Antipater	1	Cato	1
	<hr/>		<hr/>
	6		4

Total: 10.

2. *Historical Perfect in the subordinate; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

<i>pronoun</i>		<i>adverb</i>	
Plautus	8	Plautus	5
Terence	2	L. Pomponius	1
S. Turpilius	1	Ennius	1
Ennius	1		<hr/>
L. Cassius Hemina	1		7
	<hr/>		
	13		

Total: 20.

3. *Imperfect in the subordinate; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

<i>pronoun</i>		<i>adverb</i>	
Plautus	5	Plautus	1
Terence	1	Attius	1
Lucilius	2	Sisenna	2
Sisenna	1		<hr/>
	<hr/>		4
	9		

Total: 13.

4. *Pluperfect in the subordinate; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

<i>pronoun</i>			<i>adverb</i>	
Plautus	6		Plautus	1
Terence	1			
	—			
	7			
Total: 8.				

CAUSAL SENTENCES.

1. *Historical Present in the subordinate; Historical Perfect in the principal clause.*

<i>quia</i>	
Plautus	2

2. *Historical Perfect in the subordinate; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

<i>quia</i>	
Terence	1

3. *Imperfect in the subordinate; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

<i>quia</i>		<i>quod</i>		<i>propterea quod</i>	
Terence	1	Varro	1	Sisenna	1
Total: 3.					

4. *Pluperfect in the subordinate; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

<i>quod</i>	
Terence	1

It seems clear from a study of all the above tables that the use of the Historical Present in subordinate clauses is to be explained neither by the relative position of these clauses to their principal clauses, nor by the attraction of the subordinate to the principal verb, but is, rather, independent, and, as has already been emphasized, parallel to the use of the tense in principal clauses.

It will not be necessary to do more than briefly classify and cite the passages. They may be divided into single sentences composed of one or more subordinate clauses and one principal clause, in which no variation

of the Historical Present with other tenses occurs in the subordinate clauses; and longer passages composed of two or more subordinate and principal clauses, in which such variation does occur.

A.¹

TEMPORAL SENTENCES.

1. *Historical Present in the subordinate; Historical Present in the principal clause.*a. *postquam*.²

Curculio 683:

Postquam nil fit, clamore hominem posco.

L. Afranius 207-9:

postquam se uidet

Inibi esse, gnatam paruulam sororibus

Commendat.

Cf. *Caecilius Statius* 4.

b. *quoniam*.³

Truculentus 401-3:

Mater ancillas iubet,

Quoniam iam decumus mensis aduentat prope,

Aliam aliorum ire.

¹ The single sentences cited above often occur in longer passages in which the independent verbs show a variation of the Historical Present with other tenses. Sentences in which two subordinate clauses depend upon one principal verb are cited under the heading of each clause.

² In order that all the examples of each kind of temporal sentence may be grouped together, references are given to the occurrences of sentences like the above in passages in which there is a variation of tenses in the subordinate clauses: *Captiui* 487; *Miles Gloriosus* 124-5; *Hecyra* 187-8; *Phormio* 632-33.

³ *Aulularia* 377; *Bacchides* 290-91, 299-300; *Cistellaria* 164-65; *Poenulus* 68-9.

⁴ *Bacchides* 304-5; *Epidicus* 217.

c. *quom.*⁴

Heauton Timorumenos 650-51 :

quom exponendam *dō* illi, de digito anulum
Detraho.

Cf. *Andria* 362; *Hecyra* 39-40; Attius 436.

In Ennius, *Comoediae* 386 the principal clause is wanting :

Cum desubito me *orat* mulier lacrimansque ad genua *accidit*.

Cf. *Annales* 411-12 and 496.

d. *ubi.*¹

Captiui 501 :

. . . *ubi* quisque *vident*, *eunt* obuiam.

Cf. *Miles Gloriosus* 178; *Adelphi* 471-72; Sextus Turpilii 194-95.

In Pacuvius 69 the principal clause is wanting :

Vbi ego me *graudam sentio* adgrauescere.

Ennius, *Annales* 65 :

Occiduntur ubi, potitur ratu' Romulu' praedam.

Q. Claudius Quadrigarius 10, line 26 :

ubi eum *euerit*, caput *praecidit*.

e. *dum.*²

Bacchides 950-51; ³ *Miles Gloriosus* 308; *Trinummus* 166-68; *Eunuchus* 328; Ennius, *Annales* 236; Q. Claudius Quadrigarius 13.

¹ *Anphitruo* 1061, where the principal verb is not expressed; *Casina* 915, 922; *Mercator* 80-2; *Miles Gloriosus* 114-15; *Mostellaria* 1051-52; *Pseudolus* 1278; *Eunuchus* 132-34, 255-56, 414; *Hecyra* 183-84, 185; *Heauton Timorumenos* 276-77 (so Dziatzko, after Bentley), 304-5; *Phormio* 862; Ennius, *Tragoediae* 180, where the principal verb is wanting.

In passages like the above occurring where there is a variation of subordinate tenses there is one example of *ut*, *Mercator* 100; and one of *priusquam*, *Poenulus* 66-7.

² *Amphitruo* 1120; *Bacchides* 279; *Casina* 909; *Mercator* 193; *Stichus* 366-67; *Eunuchus* 255, 583, 843-44; Q. Claudius Quadrigarius 10, lines 20-1.

³ According to Ritschl and others; MSS have Perfect in the subordinate clause.

2. *Historical Present in the subordinate; Historical Perfect in the principal clause.*

a. *postquam*.¹

Persa 822, where the principal tense is a pure rather than historical Perfect:

Iam diu *factumst*, *postquam bibimus*.

Cf. *Andria* 513-14:

nunc, *postquam uidet*
Nuptias domi adparari, *missast* ancilla ilico.

b. *quoniam*.²

Poenulus 665:

Inde huc *aufugit*, *quoniam capitur* oppidum.

Cf. *Casina* 583.

c. *quom*.

Amphitruo 668:

Grauidam ego illanc hic *reliqui*, *quom abeo*.

Eunuchus 792-93:

quom tibi do istam uirginem,
Dixtin hos dies mihi soli dare te?

Cf. *Captiui* 282.

d. *priusquam*.³

Curculio 637:

. . . *priusquam* moritur mihi dedit.

¹ *Menaechmi* 24-5; *Trinummus* 108-113; *Hecyra* 120-21, 126-28, 158-59.

² *Aulularia* 9; *Bacchides* 292; *Casina* 885-86; *Menaechmi* 481-83; *Rudens* 67-8; *Trinummus* 112-13.

³ In passages like the above occurring where there is a variation of subordinate tenses there are the following examples of *ubi*: *Cistellaria* 160-61; *Stichus* 558, where the principal clause is itself subordinate to another verb; *Eunuchus* 260-61, 517; *Heauton Timorumenos* 276-77. And the following examples of *donec*: *Cistellaria* 581-83; *Mercator* 194 (so Leo; see Chapter III, p. 45, note).

*e. dum.*¹

Casina 241, 976; *Cistellaria* 90-1; *Curculio* 682; *Menaechmi* 449; *Mercator* 924; *Miles Gloriosus* 504-5;² *Mostellaria* 1017-18; *Poenulus* 803-04;³ *Rudens* 367-68; *Trinummus* 839; *Adelphi* 541-42, 691, 868-69;⁴ *Eunuchus* 341, 949-50; *Hecyra* 829; *Heauton Timorumenos* 257-58, 272, 491-2, 983; *Phormio* 1007; *Sextus Turpilius* 149; *L. Pomponius* 190.

3. *Historical Present in the subordinate ; Imperfect in the principal clause.*

a. postquam.

Phormio 569-72 is sometimes quoted as an illustration, and hence is included here. But the principal verb upon which the subordinate verb really depends is a Perfect Infinitive depending upon the Imperfect Indicative:⁵

Postquam uidet me eius mater esse hic diutius,
Simul autem non manebat aetas uirginis
Meam neclegentiam: ipsam cum omni familia
Ad me profectam esse aibant.

*b. quom.*⁶

Menaechmi 1136:

Hunc censebat te esse, credo, quom uocat te ad prandium.

¹ *Amphitruo* 1098-99; *Mercator* 97-8; *Pseudolus* 1279; *Rudens* 37; *Eunuchus* 629, 632-33; *Phormio* 76; *Heauton Timorumenos* 399, 655; *Hecyra* 800-1.

² According to Leo's reading the subordinate tense is a Perfect.

³ According to Leo's punctuation this sentence belongs under 1, *e.*

⁴ The principal tense is a pure rather than historical Perfect.

⁵ Lange, *op. cit.*, p. 10, foot-note 18, explains the Imperfect as follows: "imperfectum aibant in cotidiano sermonis usu idem fere valet quod dixerunt et h. l. sine dubio propter praecedens imperfectum manebat admissum est."

⁶ *Menaechmi* 29, 1053-54; *Hecyra* 115-16.

Eunuchus 345 :

. . . huc quom aduenio, nulla erat.

Cf. *Captiui* 887; *Menaechmi* 1115.

c. dum.¹

Lucilius 1014-17.

4. *Historical Present in the subordinate ; Pluperfect in the principal clause.*²

a. quom.³

Mercator 617 :

Iam addicta atque abducta erat, quom ad portum uenio.

Eunuchus 342-3 :

quom huc respicio ad uirginem,

Illa sese interea commodum huc aduorterat.

b. dum.

Ennius, *Annales* 391.

5. *Historical Perfect in the subordinate ; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

a. postquam.⁴

Mercator 256-7 :

Postquam id quod uolui transegi, ibi ego conspikor
Nauem.

¹ *Hecyra* 802-3.

² There is an example of the Historical Present in the subordinate, and the Historical Infinitive in the principal clause in a passage in which a variation of subordinate tenses occurs: *Bacchides* 289, where the subordinate clause is introduced by *ubi*.

³ *Eunuchus* 522, where the principal tense is itself subordinate to another verb.

⁴ *Amphitruo* 227, 1091-93, 1107-8, 1111, 1114-15; *Bacchides* 277; *Captiui* 507; *Curculio* 336, 349, 354; *Epidicus* 242-45; *Menaechmi* 37-40; *Miles Gloriosus* 121-22; *Mostellaria* 1048-49; *Pseudolus* 1272-73; *Andria* 491; *Eunuchus* 137-38.

Hecyra 367-68 :

*Postquam me aspexere ancillae aduenisse omnes ilico
Laetae exclamant.*

Sextus Turpilius 72-3 :

*postquam ad aedem uenimus,
Veneratur deos.*

Cf. *Curculio* 646; *Mercator* 262-63; *Mostellaria* 485-86;
Truculentus 647; *Hecyra* 267-68, 376.

Naevius, *Bellum Punicum* 3-4 :

*Postquamde aves aspexit in templo Anchisa,
Sacra in mensa Penatium ordine ponuntur.*

Ennius, *Annales* 162-63 :

*Postquam defessi sunt stare et spargere sese
Hastis ansatis, concurrunt undique telis.*

b. *quoniam*.¹

Asinaria 350-51 :

*Quoniam ille elocutus haec sic
Extemplo facio facetum me.*

c. *ubi*.²

Aulularia 708 :

Vbi ille abiit, ego me deorsum duco de arbore.

Adelphi 618-19 :

*ubi eam uidi, ilico
Accedo.*

Cf. *Cistellaria* 577 ;³ *Curculio* 595-96.

Lucilius 16 :

Haec ubi dicta dedit, pausam facit ore loquendi.

¹ *Mostellaria* 1050.

² *Amphitruo* 211-13, 216-17, 242-43, 1092-93; *Miles Gloriosus* 109-10; *Eunuchus* 576, 844, where the principal verb is not expressed; *Heauton Timorumenos* 121-22, 275; *Hecyra* 189-90.

³ According to the reading of Goetz and Schoell, which, however, they mark as corrupt, the principal verb is *interrogo*. Other readings substitute the participle *obsecrans* for this verb, and make *inquam* in 578 the principal verb.

Q. Claudius Quadrigarius 73 :

Vbi decreuerunt, commemorant Graccho, foedus prior Pompeianum non esse seruatum.

*d. ut.*¹

Poenulus 650-52 :

ut ad portum processimus,
Atque istum e naui ibi exeuntem oneraria
Videmus.

Andria 590 :

. . . *ut hinc te intro ire iussi, opportune hic fit mi obuiam.*

Cf. *Hecyra* 365-68.

6. *Imperfect in the subordinate ; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

ut.

Asinaria 343 :

Verum in tonstrina *ut sedebam*, me *infit* percontarier.

Adelphi 406 :

Nam *ut numerabatur* forte argentum, *interuenit.*

7. *Pluperfect in the subordinate ; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

a. postquam.

Captiui 24-5 :

Postquam belligerant Aetoli illi cum Aleis,
. . . . *capitur* alter filius.

b. ut.

Curculio 646-47 :

iam *ut me conlocauerat*,
Exoritur uentus turbo.

¹ *Bacchides* 278-79; *Phormio* 617.

Hecyra 378:

iam ut limen exieram,¹ ad genua accidit.

Cf. *Adelphi* 618-19.

RELATIVE SENTENCES.²

1. *Historical Present in the subordinate; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

a. *pronoun.*³

Ennius, *Annales* 294-6:

Haece locutu' vocat, quoi tum bene saepe libenter
Mensam sermonesque suos rerumque suarum
Inpartit cumulum.

Cf. 304-5 and 309 of the same passage.

Coelius Antipater 8:

Qui intellegunt quae fiant, dissentiuntur.

b. *adverb.*⁴

Cato 139:

Qua molissimum est, adorianitur.

¹ So Dziatzko for the *exirem* of the MSS.

² In the citation of relative sentences it will not be necessary to classify them according to the more or less intimate connection between their subordinate and principal clauses. The reasons for the occurrence of the Historical Present and of other tenses in the subordinate clauses have been indicated above, pp. 79-80. Hoffmann, in classing these clauses with subjunctive subordinate clauses (see above, p. 77, note), explains their tenses in accordance with his principle of the sequence of tenses after the Historical Present, which will be commented upon in Chapter V. See pp. 32-34 of his treatise.

³ References will be given to relative sentences like the above in passages in which there is a variation of the Historical Present with other tenses in the subordinate clauses: *Amphitruo* 231-32; *Curculio* 353 (see Chapter III, p. 39, note); *Miles Gloriosus* 117; *Andria* 491.

⁴ *Miles Gloriosus* 115; *Mostellaria* 1051-52; *Eunuchus* 844.

3. *Historical Perfect in the subordinate ; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

a. *pronoun*.¹

Mercator 260-61 :

Atque ibi ego *aspicio* forma eximia mulierem,
Filius *quam aduexit*.

Andria 104-5 :

Fere in diebus paucis, *quibus haec acta sunt*,
Chrysis . . . *moritur*.

Sextus Turpilius 203 :

Dat ultro ac muneratur quod ab illo abstulit.

Cf. *Mercator* 256-57; *Andria* 591; *Ennius, Annales* 401-2.

L. Cassius Hemina 11 :

Sus parit parcos triginta, *cuius rei fanum fecerunt* laribus Grundilibus.

b. *adverb*.²

L. Pomponius 40 :

Et *ubi insilui* in coleatum eculeum, ibi *tolutim tortor*.

Ennius, Annales 501 :

Qua murum fieri voluit, urgentur in unum.

4. *Imperfect in the subordinate ; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

a. *pronoun*.³

Truculentus 647-48 :

. . . *aduenit* si deis placet
Ad uillam argentum meo *qui debebat* patri,
Qui ouis Taretinas *erat mercatus*⁴ de patre.

¹ *Amphitruo* 1103; *Miles Gloriosus* 120, 122, 127; *Poenulus* 72, 87.

² *Amphitruo* 235, 1067; *Mercator* 80-1, 95-6; *Miles Gloriosus* 118.

³ *Captiui* 482-83; *Casina* 41-2; *Miles Gloriosus* 110-11; *Rudens* 58.

⁴ See below, 5.

Andria 118 :

inter mulieres,

Quae ibi aderant, forte unam aspicio adulescentulam.

Lucilius 453 :

. . . *inquit qui cepe serebat.*

Cf. *ibid.* 217-18 ; L. Cornelius Sisenna 9.

*b. adverb.*¹

Attius 629-30 :

nauem in fugam

*Transdunt*² subter saxa ad laeuam, qua mons *mollibat* mare.

L. Cornelius Sisenna 126 :

*Quam maxime celatim poterat, in insidiis suos
disponit.*

Cf. *ibid.* 87.

5. *Pluperfect in the subordinate ; Historical Present in
the principal clause.*

*pronoun.*³

Truculentus 547-49. See above, 4, *a*.

CAUSAL SENTENCES.

1. *Historical Present in the subordinate ; Historical
Perfect in the principal clause.*

*quia.*⁴

Rudens 366-67 :

De naui timidæ ambæ in scapham *insiluimus, quia uidemus*
Ad saxa nauem ferrier.

¹ *Cistellaria* 161-62.

² The readings vary, but are all Historical Presents.

³ *Bacchides* 263-64; *Cistellaria* 179, 185-87; *Mercator* 90-1; *Poenulus* 65-6; *Rudens* 59-60; *Eunuchus* 256; and *adverb, Amphitruo* 241.

⁴ *Stichus* 564.

2. *Historical Perfect in the subordinate ; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

quia.

Andria 121-23 :

*Quia*¹ tum mihi lamentari praeter ceteras
Visast, et *quia erat*² forma praeter ceteras
 Honesta ac liberali, *accedo*.

3. *Imperfect in the subordinate ; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

a. *quia.*

Andria 122-23. See the preceding passage.

b. *quod.*

Varro, *de re rustica* III, 5, 18 :

Pavo surgit, quod . . . *custos dicebatur* deprensus.

L. Cornelius Sisenna 23 :

Manualis lapides *dispertit*, propterea *quod* is ager omnis eius modi telis *indigebat*.

4. *Pluperfect in the subordinate ; Historical Present in the principal clause.*

quod.

Hecyra 368 :

Laeta exclamant 'uenit', id *quod* me repente *aspexerant*.

¹ So Dziatzko after Spengel; Umpfenbach, *quae*.

² See below, 3, a.

B.¹1. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect.*1. *Temporal clauses.*

a. Clauses introduced by the same temporal particle.

Hecauton Timorumenos 275-306 : ²

275 *Vbi uentum* ad aedis *est*, Dromo *pultat* fores;
 Anus quaedam *prodit*; haec *ubi aperit* ostium,
 Continuo hic se *coniecit* intro, ego *consequor*;

.

Vbi dicimus redisse te et rogare uti

305 Veniret ad te, mulier telam *desinit*
 Continuo et lacrimis *opplet* os totum sibi.

Cf. *ibid.*, 121-28 ; ³ *Eunuchus* 512-22. ⁴

In Ennius, *Tragoediae* 180-81 the principal clause is wanting and one particle introduces two tenses :

Nam *ubi introductast* puerumque ut laverent *locant*
 In clipeo.

b. Clauses introduced by different temporal particles.

In some passages no variation occurs in the tenses of the principal clauses.

Eunuchus 132-38 : ⁵

Is *ubi* esse hanc forma *uidet* honesta uirginem
 Et fidibus scire, pretium sperans ilico
Producit, uendit.

 *postquam sensit* me tecum quoque
 Rem habere, *fingit* causas ne det sedulo.

¹ In the passages cited to illustrate the variation of the Historical Present with other tenses in subordinate clauses there is also a similar variation in the tenses of the principal clauses, except when the contrary is expressly noted; but the special forms of variation found in the two kinds of clauses do not always coincide.

² See Chapter III, pp. 51-2.

³ p. 52.

⁴ p. 67.

⁵ p. 40.

Cf. *Aulularia* 9-17; ¹ *Captiui* 501-7; ² *Phormio* 617-33. ³
In *Heauton Timorumenos* 655-57 and *Eunuchus* 843-45
one of the two temporal clauses is introduced by *dum*.

In other passages variation occurs also in the tenses
of the principal clauses.

Bacchides 277-305: ⁴

Postquam aurum abstulimus, in nauem conscendimus,
Domi cupientes. forte ut adsedi in stega,
Dum circumspecto me, atque ego lembum conspicio

.
.
.

Vbi portu eximus, homines remigio sequi,
290 *Neque aues neque uenti citius. quoniam sentio*
Quae res gereretur, nauem extemplo statuimus.
Quoniam uident nos stare, occeperunt ratem
Tardare in portu.

.
.

Quoniam uidemus auro insidias fieri,
300 *Capimus consilium continuo.*

.
.

Tristes ilico,

Quom extemplo a portu ire nos cum auro uident,
305 *Subducunt lembum capitibus cassantibus.*

Phormio 859-67: ⁵

Vt modo argentum tibi dedimus apud forum, recta domum
860 *Sumus profecti;*

.
.
Vbi in gynaeceum ire occipio, puer ad me adcurrit Mida

.
.
ait esse uetitum intro ad eram accedere.

.
.
hoc ubi audiui, ad fores
Suspensio gradu placide ire perrexi, accessi, astiti.

Cf. *Aulularia* 377-83; ⁶ *Casina* 881-922; ⁷ *Cistellaria*
567-83; ⁸ *Pseudolus* 1272-78; ⁹ *Stichus* 364-67; ¹⁰ *Am-*
phitruo 1091-1120, ¹¹ where the only subordinate Presents

¹ The principal clauses contain no Historical Present.

² See Chapter III, p. 49. ³ p. 48. ⁴ p. 61. ⁵ p. 36. ⁶ p. 37.

⁷ p. 47. ⁸ p. 53. ⁹ pp. 53-4. ¹⁰ p. 50. ¹¹ pp. 58-9.

are introduced by *dum* ; cf. *Eunuchus* 629 - 35. ¹

In *Trinummus* 108-13 two subordinate clauses, one of which contains two different tenses, have the same principal clause :

Nam *postquam* hic eius rem *confregit* filius
Videt que ipse ad pauperiem prostratum esse se
 110 Suamque filiam esse adultam uirginem,
 Simul eius matrem, suampte uxorem, mortuam :
Quoniam hinc *iturus* ipsus in Sileuciam,
 Mihi *commendauit* uirginem.

2. Temporal and relative clauses.

Mostellaria 1044-52 : ²

Nam erus me *postquam* rus *misit* filium ut suum arcesserem,
 1045 *Abii* illac per angiportum ad hortum nostrum clanculum.
 : : : : : : : :
Postquam ex opsidione in tutum *eduxi* manipularis meos,
Capio consilium, ut senatum congruerronum conuocem.
 1050 *Quoniam* *conuocaui*, atque illi me ex senatu *segregant*.
Vbi ego me *uideo* uenire in meo foro, *quantum potest*
Facio idem quod plurimi alii quibus res timida aut turbidast.

In *Heauton Timorumenos* 399 the temporal clause is introduced by *dum* and the one principal verb is an Historical Perfect.

2. The Historical Present varied with the Imperfect.

Temporal and relative clauses.

In *Phormio* 76-110 ³ the temporal clauses, which contain the Presents, are introduced by *dum*.

In *Q. Claudius Quadrigarius* 10 ⁴ the temporal clauses, which contain the Presents, are introduced by different particles, one of which is *dum*.

¹ See Chapter III, p. 56.

² p. 38.

³ pp. 67-9.

⁴ pp. 75-6.

3. *The Historical Present varied with the Pluperfect.
Temporal and relative clauses.*

Menaechmi 480-84; ¹ *Eunuchus* 234-61.

4. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical
Perfect and the Imperfect.*

1. *Temporal and relative clauses.*

Captivi 478-87: ²

Nam ego *ut* dudum hinc *abii*, *accessi* ad adulescentes in foro:

· · · · ·

482 *Dico* unum ridiculum dictum de dictis melioribus,
Quibus solebam menstrualis epulas ante adipiscier:

· · · · ·

Ab eo ab illis, *postquam uideo* me sic ludificarier.

2. *Temporal and causal clauses.*

Mercator 191-200, ³ where the only subordinate Present is introduced by *dum*.

3. *Temporal, relative and causal clauses.*

Menaechmi 1052-57, where the principal clauses contain no Historical Presents:

Eripui, homines *quom ferebant* te sublimen quattuor,
Apud hasce aedis. tu *clamabas* deum fidem atque hominum omnium:
Quom ego *accurro* teque *eripio* ui pugnando ingratiis.
Ob eam rem, *quia* te *seruaui* me *amisisti* liberum.
Quom argentum *dixi* me petere et uasa, tu *quantum potest*
Praecucurristi obuiam.

¹ See Chapter III, p. 54. ² p. 36. ³ p. 45.

5. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect and the Pluperfect.*

1. *Temporal and relative clauses.*

Poenulus 64-87 : ¹

- Sed illi seni, *qui mortuost*, ei filius
 65 Vincus *qui fuerat*, abdituios a patre,
 Puer septuennis *surripitur* Carthagine,
 Sexennio *prius* quidem *quam moritur* pater.
Quoniam periisse sibi *uidet* gnatum unicum,
Conicitur ipse in morbum ex aegritudine
 : : : : : :
 Ille *qui surripuit* puerum, Calydonem *auehit* :
Vendit eum domino.
 :
 75 *Emit* senex
 Puerum illum eumque *adoptat* sibi pro filio
 Eumque heredem *fecit*, quom ipse *obiit* diem.
 : : : : : : :
 : : : : : : :
 :
 Carthaginensi duae *fuere* filae :
 85 Altera quinquennis, altera quadrimula.
 Cum nutrice una *periere* eae Megaribus.
 Eas *qui surripuit*, in Anactorium *deuehit* :

Cf. *Amphitruo* 203-60. ²

2. *Temporal and causal clauses.*

Eunuchus 575-92, ³ where the only subordinate Presents are introduced by *dum*.

6. *The Historical Present varied with the Historical Perfect, the Imperfect and the Pluperfect.*

Temporal and relative clauses.

Cistellaria 160-96 : ⁴

- 160 Is *ubi* malam rem *scit* se meruisse, ilico
 Pedibus perfugium *peperit*, in Lemnum *aufugit*,
Vbi habitabat. tum illa, *quam compresserat*,

¹ See Chapter III, pp. 42-3. ² pp. 59-60. ³ pp. 48-9. ⁴ p. 43.

- Decumo post mense exacto hic *peperit* filiam.
Quoniam reum eius facti *nescit* qui siet,
 165 Paternum seruom sui *participat* consili:

Postquam ille uxori iusta *fecit*, ilico
 Huc *commigravit*. *duxit* uxorem hic sibi
 Eandem, *quam* olim uirginem hic *compresserat*.
Vt eam *cognoscit* esse, *quam* *compresserat*,
 180 Illa illi *dicit* eius se ex iniuria
 Peperisse gnatam clam atque eam se seruo ilico
 Dedisse exponendam. ille extemplo seruolum
Iubet illum eundem persequi, si qua queat
 Reperire quae sustulerit. ei rei nunc suam
 185 Operam usque assiduo seruos *dat*, si possiet
 Meretricem illam inuenire, *quam* olim tollere,
Quom ipse *exponebat*, ex insidiis *uiderat*.

 195 hoc *ubi*
Mater rescivit, *iussit* accersi eam domum.

Cf. *Menaechmi* 24-66;¹ *Miles Gloriosus* 109-33;² *He-cyra* 115-191.³

¹ See Chapter III, p. 57.

² pp. 46-7.

³ p. 69.

CHAPTER V.

THE SEQUENCE OF TENSES AFTER THE HISTORICAL PRESENT.

It has been commonly said of the Historical Present that in its influence on dependent verbs it is regarded as either a primary or a secondary tense, according as its form or its logical meaning predominates. This view was first opposed by Hug,¹ who maintained that the present sequence after the Historical Present was due to the meaning as well as to the form of the tense: "Denn wenn eine vergangene Haupthandlung so lebhaft vor die Seele tritt dass sie als gegenwärtig angeschaut wird—und das ist doch der Sinn des Praesens hist.—so sollten offenbar auch die damit gleichzeitigen Nebenhandlungen in die Gegenwart treten, also Imperfect zum Präsens werden, oder wenn sie vorgegangen sind, in die Zeit rücken die ein Vorhergegangensein in Beziehung auf die Gegenwart ausdrückt, also vom Plusquamperfect ins Perfect." But this sequence, logical as it would be, is not always observed, and often the past sequence is employed in its stead. Such variation, however, according to Hug, does not depend upon the arbitrary choice of the writer. On the contrary, it is governed by some principle, none the less fundamental because the writer follows it by instinct rather than by conscious effort. This "Grundprincip" Hug tried to establish as follows: "Die Construction des Präsens hist. als Präsens ist am meisten bei den Nebensätzen durchgedrungen, die dem Hauptsatze, der das

¹ *Die Consecutio temporum des Praesens historicum zunächst bei Caesar, Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, 1860, pp. 877 ff. See Hoffmann, *Zeitfolge nach dem Praesens historicum*, pp. 1 ff. Hug included in his treatment such subordinate clauses as have been discussed in Chapter IV.

Präsens hist. hat, am nächsten stehen, mit ihm am innigsten zusammenhängen." Furthermore, in the case of subjunctive subordinate clauses he maintained that the position of the subordinate clause in relation to the principal influences the sequence of tenses according to the following rules:

"a. Wenn der Nebensatz dem Praes. hist. des Hauptsatzes nachfolgt, so können beide Constructionen *promiscue* angewendet werden.

"b. Wenn der Nebensatz dem Praesens hist. des Hauptsatzes vorangeht, so wird er in der Regel in's Imperfect gesetzt, einige wenige Fälle ausgenommen in welchen schon vorher Hauptsätze in's Praes. hist. gesetzt sind, oder bei kurzen indirecten Fragesätzen, deren Verbum ganz in der Nähe des Verbum finitum steht."

The reason given by Hug for the latter rule was that the writer "sich gewissermassen scheute, die Nebenhandlung hineinzuziehen, bevor er die Haupthandlung hineingezogen hatte, oder: er scheute sich die Folgerung zu ziehen, bevor die Ursache gesetzt war".

The same results that Hug reached through a study of the subject in Caesar were reached about the same time by Reusch through a study of the subject in Cicero,¹ and the theory that the sequence of tenses after the Historical Present is conditioned by the position of the subordinate clause has been accepted by many grammarians.

Hoffmann, in his treatise already referred to, made a vigorous attack upon this theory. With justice he exposed its inconsistencies, and then proceeded in an exhaustive treatment of the subject, based upon a study of all the ante-classical authors, of Cicero, Caesar, Nepos, Sallust, Vergil, Livy, Ovid, Velleius, Curtius,

¹ *Zur Lehre von der Tempusfolge*, Elbing 1861. See Hoffmann, *op. cit.*, p. 4. Reusch also included indicative subordinate clauses.

Tacitus, the younger Pliny, Florus and Eutropus, to establish a theory to the effect that the Historical Present is a purely preterite tense, and can be followed by only the past sequence, except in the case of a certain class of subordinate clauses which naturally, from their relation to the rest of the sentence, tend toward the present sequence :¹

“Dürfen wir das Resultat unserer Untersuchung dahin zusammenfassen, dass das Praesens hist. dem Lateiner nur als Praeteritum gegolten hat, und dass somit alle um ein Präsens hist. sich gruppierenden Nebensätze in den der Lage zu einem Praeteritum entsprechenden relativen Zeiten gegeben werden müssen,—dass jedoch von dieser temporalen Unterordnung solche indicativische oder conjunctivische Nebensätze ausgenommen sind, die entweder nur einen begrifflichen Bestandtheil des Hauptsatzes bilden, oder die Aussage desselben, sei es als Object, sei es als Epexege, vervollständigen, und weiter solche conjunctivische Relativ-, Final-, und Fragesätze, die, als im Sinne des Subjects gehalten, durch die praesentische Zeitform von den in die Erzählung gehörigen, vom Standpunkte des Berichtstatters aus formulierten geschieden werden sollen.”² Any other cases of present sequence he does away with by maintaining that the principal verb upon which the subordinate clauses depend is no longer an Historical Present but has been made by them into a “real Present”.³

That Hoffmann’s distinction between the “Historical Present” and the “real Present” is valueless, has been shown in Chapter II. With this distinction removed his results in regard to subjunctive subordinate clauses may

¹ See Chapter IV, p. 77, note, for Hoffmann’s division of subordinate clauses.

² pp. 97-8.

³ p. 25: “das Praesens des Hauptsatzes . . . wird auf dem Boden der praesentischen Nebensätze zum wirklichen Praesens.” See Chapter I, p. 6, note.

be accepted, and stated as follows: the Historical Present may be followed by either the present or the past sequence; but, as should be expected, the present predominates in those subordinate clauses that are most intimately connected with their principal clauses in that they expand the activity of the principal verb, or express ideas existing in the mind of the subject of this verb, rather than in the mind of the narrator.¹

That such a principle adequately accounts for the sequence of tenses after the Historical Present in early Latin, will be seen from a study of the passages. By far the greater number of the subjunctive subordinate clauses dependent upon an Historical Present are final or consecutive or of indirect question; that is, they express ideas present in the mind of the subject of the principal verb, or contain the necessary expansion of his activity. Of these sixty-five show the present sequence, twenty the past sequence. The same principle explains the present sequence in the one example of a subjunctive temporal clause introduced by *priusquam*, which is in reality a final clause. But subjunctive temporal clauses introduced by *cum*, which have reference to the point of view of the narrator and express his knowledge of the temporal relation between past events, contain only the past sequence.²

The following tabular statements will give the statistics of the sequence of tenses in different kinds of subjunctive subordinate clauses dependent upon an Historical Present, together with the relative position of these clauses and their principal clauses:

¹ It will be noticed that the above principle closely resembles Hug's "Grund-princip".

² It must be noted that all but one of the examples of past sequence in *cum* clauses are found in Varro, where in most cases the principal Historical Present is a form of *inquam*.

TEMPORAL SENTENCES.

<i>priusquam</i>	<i>subordinate clause pre- cedes principal</i>	<i>subordinate clause follows principal</i>
Present sequence..... I I
<i>cum</i>		
Past sequence..... 13 12 I

FINAL SENTENCES.

<i>ut</i>	<i>subordinate clause pre- cedes principal</i>	<i>subordinate clause follows principal</i>
Present sequence..... 26 2 24
Past sequence..... 12 1 11
38	3	35
<i>without ut</i>		
Present sequence..... 2 2
<i>ne</i>		
Present sequence..... 6 6
Past sequence..... 1 1
7 7
<i>relative</i>		
Present sequence..... 3 3
Past sequence..... 4 2 1
7 5

CONSECUTIVE SENTENCES.

<i>ut</i>	<i>subordinate clause pre- cedes principal</i>	<i>subordinate clause follows principal</i>
Past sequence..... I I
<i>ut qui</i>		
Present sequence..... I I
<i>quin</i>		
Present sequence..... 3 3
<i>relative</i>		
Present sequence..... 2 I I

SENTENCES OF INDIRECT QUESTION.

<i>relative</i>	<i>subordinate clause precedes principal</i>	<i>subordinate clause follows principal</i>
Present sequence.....19 2 17
Past sequence.....2 2
<hr/> 21	<hr/> 19
<i>si</i>		
Present sequence.....2 2
<i>ne</i>		
Present sequence.....1 1

These tables show: 14 temporal sentences, of which 1 has the present, 13 have the past sequence; 54 final sentences, of which 37 have the present, 17 the past sequence; 7 consecutive sentences, of which 6 have the present, 1 has the past sequence; and 24 sentences of indirect question, of which 22 have the present, 2 the past sequence.

In addition to the subordinate clauses included in the above tables may be noted clauses of indirect discourse (temporal, final, conditional) following a verb of saying in the Historical Present. Of these clauses some show the present and others the past sequence, while all follow their principal clauses. In a few cases, even after the same verb the clauses vary between the present and the past sequence.

The cause for the variation of present and past sequence, which occurs even in the clauses that are most intimately connected with their principal clauses, is probably, despite of Hoffmann, to be sought in the dual nature of the Historical Present. This tense, since it has the force of a present tense, representing the past as present, is naturally followed by a present sequence of tenses; while, since it has also the force of a past tense, narrating past events, it may also be followed by a past sequence of tenses.

That in those subordinate clauses that are most closely connected with their principal clauses the present

sequence predominates is another proof that the Historical Present serves to represent the past as present, and has not, as Hoffmann claims that it has, the force of a purely preterite tense. By denying this fact Hoffmann is forced to regard the most natural present sequence after the Historical Present as an exception to the rule of past sequence, and to make a baseless distinction between two phases of one tense.

It seems doubtful whether the choice of present or past sequence depends consciously upon the degree of vividness in the representation of the past. In a carefully cultivated style, what Hale ¹ says of the part played by subordinate clauses after an Historical Present may, possibly, be true: "It is not history that is given us [by the use of the Historical Present in principal clauses], it is the mimic stage. Now, these stage-presents are followed in a dependent clause (say a final clause) now by a primary tense, now by a secondary. What is it that tells us, as we read, whether we are to keep up the fiction of the theatre, and wait to see the act of the final clause, say the intended blow of a murderer, actually performed upon the stage, or are to drop the illusion, and return to the sober narrative, namely, that this was once upon a time a purpose? It is nothing but the verb of the final clause itself. In that verb, and in no other, lie or do not lie the directions. The choice of the subordinate verb is itself just as perfect and complete a method of communication between writer and reader as is the choice, for the main verb, between the sober aorist and the stagy present." But in colloquial speech, at least, it is more probable that the variation was an unconscious result of the two elements in the Historical Present.

¹ *Sequence of Tenses in Latin*, *American Journal of Philology*, VIII, (1887) p. 63.

The passages illustrating the sequence of tenses after the Historical Present may be briefly classified and cited. It will not be necessary to subdivide the different kinds of subordinate clauses according to the special relation that they bear to their principal clauses.¹

TEMPORAL SENTENCES.

1. *Present Sequence.*

priusquam.

Amphitruo 240:

Animam omittunt prius quam loco demigrent.

2. *Past Sequence.*

cum.

Varro, *de re rustica* I, 69, 2:

Cum haec diceret, venit libertus aeditumi ad nos flens et *rogat.*

Cf. *ibid.* I, 49, 1; II, 1, 3; III, 5, 18.

Ibid. I, 3:

Stolo *cum aspexisset* Scrofam, . . . *inquit.*

Cf. *ibid.* I, 49, 1; II, 1, 1; 1, 3; 1, 11; 5, 1; III, 2, 2; 2, 10.

Ennius, *Annales* 295-97:

rerumque suarum
Inpartit cumulum, magnam *cum* lassu' diei
Partem fuisset.

FINAL SENTENCES.

1. *Present Sequence.*

a. *ut.*

Miles Gloriosus 116:

Inscendo, ut eam rem Naupactum ad erum *nuntiem.*

Mercator 104:

Postridie hospitem *adeo, oro ut* uendat mihi.

¹ For Hoffmann's elaborate subdivisions see *op. cit.*, pp. 44-97.

Andria 355 :

Continuo ad te properans *percurro* ad forum, *ut dicam* haec tibi.

Phormio 112-13 :

obsecrat,

Ut sibi eius *faciat* copiam.

C. Amphitruo 205, 1069, 1093; *Captiui* 511-12; *Casina* 42, 44, 922;¹ *Curculio* 330, 355; *Mostellaria* 1049; *Pseudolus* 1273, 1276; *Rudens* 53-4; *Andria* 592; *Eunuchus* 578-79, 582, 618, 627; *Hecyra* 116; Varro, *de re rustica* I, 69, 2.

Naevius, *Bellum Punicum* 56-8 :

Id quoque *paciscunt*, moenia *ut sint* quae concilient
Lutatium. captivos plurimos idem,
Sicilienses *paciscit* obsides *ut reddant*.

Coelius Antipater 30 :

Imperator *conclamat* de medio, *ut* uelites in sinistro cornu *remoueantur*,
Gallis non dubitatum *inmittantur*.

b. without ut.

Amphitruo 257 :

Velatis manibus *orant*, *ignoscamus* peccatum suum.

Eunuchus 583 :

Adhortor properent. . . .

c. ne.

Curculio 361 :

Deduco pedes de lecto clam, *ne* miles *sentiatur*.

Casina 321-22 :

orat obsecrat,

Ne Casinam uxorem *ducam*.

Eunuchus 138 :

. . . *fingit* causas *ne det* sedulo.

Ibid. 578 :

Edicit *ne* uir quisquam ad eam *adeat*, et mihi *ne abscedam* imperat.

¹ According to Leo.

Cf. Ennius, *Tragoediae* 180; *Incert.* (Ennius?), *Incert.* 6-7.¹

Ennius, *Annales* 304-5:

Ingenium, cui nulla malum sententia *suadet*
Vt faceret facinus levis aut malu'.

Cf. *ibid.* 19-20.

b. ne.

Casina 893:

Forem *obdo*, *ne* senex me *opprimeret*.

c. relative.

Eunuchus 581:

. paucae, quae circum illam essent, manent.

Cf. Caecilius Statius 275, where the verb upon which the subjunctive depends is introduced by *dum*; Ennius, *Tragoediae* 326.

Ennius, *Annales* 294-300:

Haec locutu' *vocat*
 : : : : :
Cui res audacter magnas parvasque iocumque
Eloqueretur.

CONSECUTIVE SENTENCES.

1. *Present Sequence.*

a. ut qui.

Andria 148-9:

Ita tum *discedo* ab illo, *ut qui* se filiam
Neget daturum.

b. quin.

Amphitruo 238-39:

Sed fugam in se tamen nemo *conuortitur*
Nec recedit loco *quin* statim rem gerat.²

¹ See Chapter III, p. 70, note.

² Hoffmann, *op. cit.*, p. 48, claims to improve the logic of this passage by reading, *Nec recedit loco, quin statim rem gerit.*

Hecyra 126-28 :

postquam uidet

Paratas nec moram ullam *quin* ducat dari,
Ibi . . . aegre tulit.

Q. Claudius Quadrigarius 70 :

Romam *uenit*, uix *superat*, *quin* triumphus decernatur.

c. relative.

Poenulus 1284-85 :

Vbi nec leno neque illae *redeunt*, nec *quod edim* quicquam datur :
Pro maiori parte prandi pignus cepi, abii foras.

Cf. *Aulularia* 377.

2. Past Sequence.

ut.

Heauton Timorumenos 306-7 :

Continuo et lacrimis *opplet* os totum sibi,
Vt facile *scires* desiderio id fieri.

SENTENCES OF INDIRECT QUESTION.

I. Present Sequence.

a. relative.

Truculentus 650-51 :

Quaerit patrem : *dico* esse in urbe, *interrogo*
Quid eum *uelit*.

Curculio 362 :

Rogant me serui *quo* eam.

Rudens 64 :

Adulescentuli alii *narrant ut* res gesta sit.

Andria 124 :

Quae sit rogo

Hecyra 831 :

Rogat unde sit

Cf. *Amphitruo* 1069 ; *Asinaria* 343-44 ; *Captiui* 510-11 ;
Cistellaria 164 ; *Curculio* 339, 340-41, 596 ; *Stichus* 366,
where the verb upon which the subjunctive depends is

introduced by *dum*; *Adelphi* 619; *Andria* 358; *Eunuchus* 341; *Phormio* 93, 863-64; *Coelius Antipater* 8.

b. si.

Cistellaria 183-86:

Iubet illum eundem persequi, si qua queat
Reperire quae sustulerit. ei rei nunc suam
Operam usque assiduo servos dat, si possiet
Meretricem illam inuenire.

Eunuchus 594:

Sto expectans, si quid mi imperent.

c. ne.

Ibid. 602-3:

simul alia circumspecto,

Satin explorata sint.

Cf. *Adelphi* 619-20.

2. Past Sequence.

relative.

Bacchides 290-91:

quoniam sentio

Quae res gereretur,¹ nauem extemplo statuimus.

Naevius, Bellum Punicum 21-2:

blande et docte percontat,

Aenea quo pacto Troiam urbem liquisset.²

INDIRECT DISCOURSE.

1. Present Sequence.

Mercator 83-4:

Dico esse iturum me mercatum, si uelit,
Amorem missum facere me, dum illi obsequar.

¹ Hoffmann, *op. cit.*, p. 87, note 74, explains the Imperfect in this passage as due to the implied potential idea: "potentiallem ea res gereretur, sc. ut aurum nobis abstraheretur."

² Vahlen reads *liquerit* after some of the MSS. Hoffmann quotes Vahlen.

Eunuchus 139-42:

Ait, si fidem habeat se iri praepositum tibi
Apud me, ac non id metuat, ne, ubi acceperim,
Sese relinquam, uelle se illam mihi dare.

Cf. *Asinaria* 347-48; *Casina* 53-4, 56-7; *Mercator* 243-44; *Poenulus* 656-58; *Phormio* 114-16.

2. *Past Sequence.*

Amphitruo 214-15:

Respondent bello se et suos tutari posse, proinde *uti*
Properiter de suis finibus exercitus deducerent.

Varro, *de re rustica* II, 8, 1:

Venit a Menate libertus *qui dicat* liba absoluta esse et rem divinam paratam;
si vellent, venirent illuc et ipsi pro se *sacrificarentur.*

Cf. *ibid.* I, 69, 2-3.

3. *Present and Past Sequence.*

Amphitruo 205-10:

Telebois *iubet* sententiam *ut dicant* suam:
Si sine ui et sine bello *uelint* rapta et raptore tradere,
Si quae *asportassent redderent*, se exercitum extemplo domum
 Reducturum, abituros agro Argiuos, pacem atque otium
 Dare illis: *sin* aliter *sient* animati neque *dent* quae *petat*,
 Sese igitur summa ui uirisque eorum oppidum oppugnassere.

Hecyra 145-47:

Narratque, ut uirgo ab se integra etiam tum *siet*,
 Seque *ante quam* eam uxorem *duxisset* domum,
 Sperasse eas tolerare posse nuptias.

Cf. *Amphitruo* 225-26.

Any analysis of syntactical usages is subject to error, and opinions may easily differ in regard to the interpretation of individual passages; but it is hoped that this study of the Historical Present in early Latin has made

clear certain general facts which may be summed up as follows :

The Historical Present is characteristic of the colloquial language, and is used to represent past events as if they were present. It is imperfect in nature and describes rather than narrates these events, as is seen from the fact that it belongs chiefly to verbs of descriptive as opposed to verbs of narrative character. Its use may be extended to verbs of aoristic conceptions when the activities denoted by them form parts of a course of events which is described as in progress in the sphere of time that the speaker is regarding as present. Its representation of the past involves a certain liveliness of narration, but it has not yet become the rhetorical device and means for producing stylistic effects that it became in literature. In historical literature, at least, it also seems to have developed an aoristic function hardly distinguishable from that of the Historical Perfect. Indications of this function, which probably sprang from the frequent colloquial use of the tense to describe aoristic activities of the past, are found in early inscriptions.

The variation of the Historical Present with other tenses in the colloquial language is governed by certain principles, which are based upon the kinds of activity denoted by the verbs, and the functions of the different tenses. In a few cases no especial reason can be assigned for its variation with the Historical Perfect, which may indicate the beginning of the aoristic function that it developed later. But in the majority of cases this variation as well as that with the other past tenses is far from being arbitrary.

ERRATA.

P. 28, note 1, for "A, 5" read "A, 6".

P. 80, line 15, for "three" read "two".

LIFE.

I was born in Ellsworth, Maine, January 1, 1871, and received my early education in the public schools of that city and a private school in Dresden. In June, 1888, I was graduated from the Ellsworth High School. In September of the same year I entered Bryn Mawr College, where I specialized in Latin and Greek. I received the degree of A. B. in June, 1892, and was awarded the Bryn Mawr European Fellowship. During the year 1892-93 I studied as a graduate student at Bryn Mawr College in the departments of Latin and Greek. During the year 1893-94 I attended the University of Leipsic, and heard lectures on Latin, Greek and Sanscrit by Professors Brugmann, Ribbeck, Gardthausen, Arndt, Lipsius and Windisch, to all of whom, and especially to Professors Brugmann and Windisch, I wish to express my thanks. During the second semester of the year 1894-95 and during the year 1895-96 I continued my graduate work in Latin and Greek at Bryn Mawr College. In May, 1896, I passed my examinations for the degree of Ph. D., in Latin as my principal, and in Greek as my subordinate subject.

My graduate work has been pursued under the direction of Professors Gonzalez Lodge and Herbert Weir Smyth, to whom my especial thanks are due for their continued kindness and assistance.

